National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XXII. NO. 36. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 18, 1862. WHOLE NO. 1,128.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, No. 5 Beekman Street, New York,

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

106 *North-Tenth Street, Philadelphia.*

Letters for publication, or relating in any way to the editorial conduct of the paper, should be addressed, "EDITOR OF THE NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD, NEW YORK."

Letters enclosing subscriptions, or relating in any way to the business affairs of the paper, should be addressed, "PUBLISHER OF THE NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD, NEW YORK."

ADVERTISEMENTS, 10 cents per line each insertion.

Selections.

MR. GEORGE THOMPSON ON AMERICAN SLAVERY AND THE PRESENT CRISIS.

From The London Star and Dial, Dec. 21.

YESTERDAY evening Mr. George Thompson, late M.P. for the Tower Hamlets, delivered, in Surrey Chapel, Blackfriars road, an oration "On American Slavery and the Present Crisis." The audience was numerous and highly respectable, and the chair was occupied by the Rev. NEWMAN HALL, the respected pastor of the chapel.

The CHAIRMAN, in introducing Mr. Thompson, said the present crisis was of the very highest importance. They might be on the brink of an unnecessary, and therefore of a wicked war (applause). He regarded war either as the greatest of crimes or the sternest of necessities, and they ought all to labor strenuously in order that it might be averted. They had not, however, assembled to hear him, and therefore he would at once give place to their eloquent friend, Mr. George Thompson.

Mr. THOMPSON, who was received with the greatest cordiality, said he appeared before them in the interests of truth, humanity, and Christian civilization. All these were involved in the fratricidal conflict which was now raging in America. It was a horrible and appalling spectacle, and in this country the greatest ignorance of the causes which had produced it existed. The reasons which had been assigned for it by our leading public men were entirely erroneous. He had been twice in the United States, he had made the institutions of the country his special study, and therefore he had enjoyed the fullest opportunities for forming an impartial judgment on the question. In opposition to all the theories put forth on the subject, he would say that slavery was the sole, simple, and exclusive cause of the struggle (cheers). But for slavery the States of America would have remained united, and whatever had menaced their harmony had proceeded from the same cause. What sort of thing, he asked, was this slavery? To be a slave was to be a thing, a chattel, to be ranked in the catalogue of sale with horses, breeding cattle, and swine. Such it was as it now existed in the seceded States of America, and it was declared to be the chief corner stone of the new republican edifice. He did not say every slave was subjected to all the horrors of slavery, but he would maintain that every slave was liable to be subjected to them (hear, and loud cheers). Mr. Thompson having depicted with great vividness the wretched condition of the 4,000,000 of slaves in the Southern States, went on to say that, with the man who claimed the right of enslaving another man, he could hold no parley. Such a person was a man-thief, an atheistical monster (applause). It was preposterous blasphemy for any man to say that he could possess a fee simple in the body of his equal. We reasoned too much about the matter; in the court of conscience one verdict, "Let it be accursed," had always been returned against slavery (cheers). Human beings might be inconsistent, but human nature had always been true to herself, and she had uttered her testimony against slavery with a shriek ever since the monster had been begotten (loud applause). Mr. Thompson then rapidly sketched the history of slavery in America, and the legislation in regard to it, from the time when the first cargo of slaves had been landed from the coast of Guinea, on the soil of Virginia, in the same year which saw the Puritans land on the bleak shores of New England, up to the election of Mr. Lincoln as President. He pointed out that when the Americans threw off the English yoke and asserted their independence, they proclaimed that all men had an inalienable right to liberty, and he showed that, if this principle had been fairly carried out, it would have swept slavery from the face of the newly emancipated States. But in the Revolutionary Congress of 1776, Mr. Jefferson's original draft of the Declaration of Independence was altered, through the influence of the slaveholders, and in the Articles of Confederation, adopted two years later, the topic of slavery was carefully and advisedly excluded (hear, hear). Fatal compromises had been introduced into the Constitution, and from them had resulted that hideous host of evils which, for seventy years, had covered the body politic with "wounds and bruises and putrifying sores." Mr. Thompson then proceeded to discuss the question whether secession was justifiable, and said the right claimed by South Carolina and her rebel confederates to secede under the Constitution was a palpable absurdity (cheers). The revolutionary right of secession was undeniable, but then it was to be recognized by the people, the nation, and not by the sworn servants of the Constitution. No government provided for its own dissolution; so that, while there was always a revolutionary right of secession, there could never be a constitutional right. If the suggestion of Kentucky had been adopted, it would have been competent for a convention to have allowed South Carolina and her confederates to secede; but, as the offer had been declined, nothing was left to the President but to uphold the Constitution which he had sworn to maintain (cheers). The lecturer having shown how the South had always maintained an ascendancy in the councils of the State, and having described the circumstances under which Mr. Lincoln had been elected, contrasted his opinions on slavery with those of Jefferson Davis. Davis believed in the Divine right of treating the negroes as an inferior race, and of keeping them in bondage. Mr. Lincoln, on the other hand, had declared that slavery was immoral. The worst charge that had been brought against Mr. Lincoln was that he had suppressed his own predilections in favor of freedom; that, having taken an oath to maintain the Constitution, he had adhered to it, and had not sacrificed the prerogatives of his position to carry out his own benevolent intentions. The truth was, that he would have rendered himself liable to impeachment if he had proclaimed the abolition of slavery. Besides, the proclamation would have been impracticable; and, even if it had been practicable, he was not sure, under the circumstances of the country, if it would have been the most Christian thing to have issued it. Mr. Thompson then argued that, although the war was not carried on by the North for the abolition of slavery, yet that the triumph of the North would greatly conduce to that sublime result (cheers). The Union, he observed, was nothing to him; but the abolition of slavery was of the very highest importance (cheers). He would not, he said, decide under what circumstances war might be justifiable, and he simply recognized the existing war as a fact. But, inasmuch as he believed that the cause of freedom would be benefited by the success of the North, he hoped it might conquer, and he wished it God speed (loud cheers). Mr. Thompson then adverted to the affair of the Trent, and said that, on the abstract merits of the question, it would be presumptuous for him to offer a decided opinion. As the highest legal minds were at work on the question, he would not lay down any dogma of his own, but it seemed strange that those who were so anxious to go to war with America were so ready in their gratuitous condemnation of the North for going to war with the South (cheers). Our flag had been insulted, it was said. But no blood had been shed; the two men who were notorious traitors to the government had been seized and taken out. The ship had been allowed to go on with the cargo and the passengers. By this act it was said our flag had been insulted, and *The Times* of that very day told them that war was the only alternative if the Americans did not apologize and surrender the prisoners—that the dispute was quite out of the category of arbitration. Well, if that was so, how could they deny to the North the right of maintaining its Constitution and of defending the honor of its flag? (Cheers.) We had not got Mr. Lincoln's answer, and yet the newspapers day by day were predicting war, and saying everything which was calculated to bring it about (approbation). America had good reason to be offended at the tone of the articles which appeared in our journals. What, he would ask them, had been the conduct of the North to the South? For a long period, to her disgrace, she had considered the South the petted child of the Union, and conceded demands which had been utterly undefensible. When she was menaced with secession, she did not arm; when the secession was an accomplished fact, she did not arm; nay, when her custom-houses, her arsenals, and armories were seized, she did not arm. But at last, when the Star of the West was fired upon, and when South Carolina would not allow a bit of Union bunting to float over her fortress, then the twenty-two million of people had determined to arm and to defend their Constitution (cheers). Mr. Thompson then showed that the secession had been long contemplated, and he condemned Mr. Buchanan for his conduct in favoring the designs of the South. He next glanced at the present position of the anti-slavery party in the North, and said it had of late greatly increased (loud cheers). He regretted that in this country the minds of the public had been corrupted by the untruthful and one-sided articles which appeared in some of the journals, and expressed an opinion that, if it had not been for this circumstance, a universal feeling of sympathy with the North would have manifested (cheers). He earnestly prayed that the war would be averted, and he hoped that the clergy would use their endeavors, as Mr. Hall had done, to promote the continuance of peace. He trusted that the sorrowful event which had clothed them with mourning outwardly, and for which, too, they all inwardly and sincerely mourned, would have some effect in allaying the war feeling and in promoting good will between the two countries. Most sincerely did they all sympathize with her Majesty in her great affliction, bereaved as she was of her friend, and counsellor, and husband. He trusted the event would be fraught with issues in favor of peace, and he thought the Minister of the day would incur a heavy, a criminal responsibility who advised that lone, sorrowing woman to put her sign manual to a declaration of war against America (loud cheers). Mr. Thompson concluded his most eloquent address, which occupied one hour and three quarters in the delivery, by reciting the following verses, which he had composed when the misunderstanding about the Oregon boundary had occurred with America. The first stanza had been written for the tune of "God Save the Queen," and a second for the most popular national air in America:

O! may the human race
Heaven's message soon embrace,
Good will to man.
Hushed be the battle's sound,
And o'er the earth around
May joy and peace abound
Through every land.

O! then shall come the glorious day
When swords and spears shall perish,
And brothers John and Jonathan
The kindest thoughts shall cherish.

When Oregon no more shall fill
With angry darts our quiver,
But Englishmen with Yankees dwell,
On the far Columbia river.

Then let us haste these bonds to knit,
And in the work be handy,
That we may blend "God save the Queen"
With "Yankee-Doodle dandy."

(Great cheering.)

The Rev. W. H. BONNER moved that a vote of thanks should be given to Mr. Thompson for his most able and eloquent lecture. He confessed he was afraid, however, that the progress of the anti-slavery party in the North was not so rapid as Mr. Thompson supposed. He also paid a high compliment to the Chairman for the efforts he had made to promote peace.

Dr. M'GOWAN, in seconding the motion, related some interesting reminiscences of Mr. Thompson's visit to America in 1834. He eulogized the efforts Mr. Thompson had then made to spread anti-slavery principles, remarking that New York had then been as pro-slavery as Liverpool was now. It gave him pleasure to confirm Mr. Thompson's statement that the anti-slavery party was becoming powerful in the Northern States.

THE SLAVES FIT FOR FREEDOM.

WE find in one of the most pertinacious of our pro-slavery journals, *The World*, a letter from a correspondent at Fort Scott, Kansas, containing some statements respecting the negroes liberated in connection with the recent march of Gen. Lane's brigade into Missouri, which are so remarkable that we transfer them to our page, as follows:

"FORT SCOTT, KANSAS, Dec. 25, 1861.

"With the approach of cold weather the question will arise in many minds: 'What is the condition of the slaves who have been liberated in the summer campaign?' And the consideration of it will bring out grave objections from those who are opposed to emancipation. Many who abhor the system of slavery for its inherent injustice are yet beset with a shrinking fear of the results of emancipation from its supposed injurious effects upon the physical condition of the negro. The fugitive, their fancy suggests, is a trembling wretch fleeing from present ills to those he knows not of. They see him with a little bundle on his back running from a comfortable home, a warm climate, probably a kind master, to cast himself upon the cold charities of a frozen North—his ultimate fate starvation or a workhouse.

"I am happy to be able to put my experience—an extensive one with Lane's brigade—in opposition to this popular idea of a 'contraband,' and I propose to state the present condition of the two thousand liberated by the march of the Kansas army. These negroes were owned principally by secessionists, but where the question was of freedom or slavery for themselves the negroes failed to make any such distinction; and when they sought our camp they were protected, and no questions were asked as to the political status of their former masters. Families came in—sometimes three generations in a single waggon; sometimes a man or woman fled away, leaving all family ties to secure personal liberty, daring untold dangers, enduring fatigue, starvation, perils by night and greater dread by day, never feeling safe till they knew they were in the Kansas camp. One day, as we marched from Osceola, we saw three men riding at full speed across the prairie. As they approached we saw that one was a negro and the others white men in pursuit. Fast came the slave, but the whites steadily gained, and one was in the act of catching the bridle of the fugitive when a borderer dashed out from the column and raised his Sharpe's rifle. 'About face' went the slave-catchers, and a rifle ball sang an ominous warning in their ears as they went off.

"But night is their great time. Sixty came to camp in one evening, and, as Gen. Lane observed, 'It wan't much of a night for niggers either.' We put the able men to work immediately driving teams, cooking, grooming the horses, and doing all the extra duties of the brigade. Each officer engaged one as a body-servant, instead of taking a soldier from his duty. In this manner they earned from eight to ten dollars a month.

"Parsons Moore, Fisher, and Fish, chaplains of the brigade, started last month with a train of negroes to establish them on Kansas farms. After three weeks these gentlemen returned to headquarters, having found comfortable situations for every man, woman and child under their charge. Many were hired as farm hands, house servants, etc., at wages from eight to twelve dollars per month, and the least effective secured places for the winter where they will be sure of food and clothing, with good chances of lucrative employment when spring opens. The fugitives are generally shrewd and industrious, and the farmers of Kansas gladly avail themselves of this supply of laborers. This is an assertion utterly at variance with the general impression. It is nevertheless literally true. In slavery one can hardly imagine a more shiftless, indolent being than a Missouri negro. But the change from slavery to freedom effects an instantaneous and complete revolution in his character. With the consciousness of liberty comes the necessity for exertion, and effort is born of necessity. The slave who worked carelessly felt that he had no interest in the result of his labor; no amount of industry would benefit him, and he naturally did as little as he could consistent with safety. But when he is a free man he rises equal to the emergency. This has been the case wherever my experience has extended. There is not a man who has been liberated by this brigade but is abundantly able and willing to take care of himself. *In every case we have found the slave fit for freedom.* The history of the contrabands of the Kansas army proves them to be possessed of attributes that would do honor to the most favored race. That the establishment of these liberated men as a free working population in Kansas will be a blessing to the young State is not doubted even by the most prejudiced who have had an opportunity to observe them during this campaign.—L. T. T."

There can be no question, we think, respecting the truth of this writer's report. No doubt these negroes are able to support themselves; nor is there any doubt that freedom will awake in them a desire for industry and its benefits unknown to them while slaves.—*Tribune.*

JOHN BRIGHT ON THE AMERICAN REBELLION.

[Extracts from a speech, delivered at Rochdale, England, Dec. 4th, 1861, by JOHN BRIGHT, Esq., M.P.]

SLAVERY THE CAUSE OF THE REBELLION.

IN the multitude of articles which have been brought before us in the newspapers within the last few months, I have no doubt you have seen, as I have seen, it stated, that this question was very much like that upon which the Colonies originally revolted against the Crown of England. It is amusing, however, how little many newspaper-writers know, and how little they think you know (laughter). When the war of independence commenced in America, ninety years ago or more, there was no representation there at all. The question was whether a Ministry in Downing street, and a corrupt and borough-mongering Parliament at Westminster, should impose taxes upon three million of English subjects, who had left their country and established themselves in North America. But now the question is not of under-representation or of no representation, because, as is perfectly notorious, the representation of the South is not only complete but in excess, for in distributing the number of representatives to the number of people—which is done every ten years in the United States—three out of every five slaves are counted for the South as if they were white men and free men, and the number of members given to them is so much greater than it would be if the really free men and white men only were counted; and it has followed from that that the South has had in the House of Representatives about twenty members more than it ought in right to have, upon the principle upon which members were apportioned to the Northern and the free States. Therefore, you will see that there is no kind of comparison between the state of things when the Colonies revolted and the state of things now, when this fearful and wicked insurrection has broken out. But there is another cause which is sometimes in England assigned for this great misfortune, which is the protective theories in operation in the United States, and the maintenance of the high tariff. It happens in regard to this that no American, certainly no one I ever met with, attributes the disaster to the Union to that cause. It is an argument made use of by ignorant Englishmen, but never by informed Americans. . . . No; the question is a very different affair—a more grave question. It is the question of slavery (hear, hear). For thirty years it has been constantly coming to the surface, disturbing social life, and overthrowing almost all political harmony in the working of the United States. In the North there is no secession, there is no collision; but this disturbance and this insurrection was found wholly in the South, and in the slave States; therefore, I think the man who says otherwise, and who contends that it is the tariff, or anything whatsoever other than slavery, is either himself deceived, or he endeavors to deceive others. The object of the South is this: to escape from the majority which wishes to limit the area of slavery (hear, hear). They wish to found a slave State, free from the influences and the opinions of freedom. The free States in the North, therefore, now stand before the world the advocates and defenders of freedom and civilization. The slave States of the South offer themselves for the recognition of Christian nations based upon the foundation, the unchangeable foundation in their eyes, of slavery and barbarism (hear, hear). I will not discuss the guilt of men who, ministers of a great nation, only last year conspired to overthrow it. I will not point out or recapitulate the statements of the fraudulent manner in which they disposed of the funds in the national exchequer. I will not point out by name any of the men in this [illegible] they won't like to hear; but I say that slavery has sought to break up the most free government in the world, and to found a new State in this nineteenth century, whose corner-stone is the perpetual bondage of millions of men (hear, hear).

WHAT HAS BEEN SAID AND DONE IN ENGLAND.

Now, let us look a little at what has been said and done in this country since the period when Parliament rose in the beginning of August. There have been two speeches to which I wish to refer in terms of approbation. The Duke of Argyll delivered a speech which was fair and friendly to the government of the United States. Lord Stanley (hear, hear) only a fortnight ago made a speech which it is impossible to read without remarking the thought, the liberality, and the wisdom by which it is distinguished. He doubted, it is true, whether the Union could be restored—but a man need not be hostile, and must not necessarily be friendly, to doubt that or the contrary—but he spoke with fairness and friendliness of the government of the United States, and he said they were right and justifiable in the course they took. I mention these two speeches as from noblemen of great distinction in this country—speeches which I believe would have a beneficial effect on the other side of the Atlantic. Lord John Russell, in the House of Commons, during the last session, made a speech, too, in which he rebuked the impertinence of a young member of the House of Commons, who spoke about the bursting of the bubble republic (hear, hear, and cheers). It was a speech worthy of the best days of Lord John Russell (cheers). At a later period he spoke at Newcastle. He described the contest in words something like these (I speak only from memory): "That the North is contending for empire, and the South for independence." Did he mean that the North was contending for empire, as England when making some fresh conquest? If he meant that, what he said was not true. But I recollect Lord John Russell, in the House of Commons some years ago, on an occasion when I had made some observations as to the unreasonable expenditure of the Colonies, and complained that the people of England should be taxed to defray the expenses which the Colonies themselves were well able to defray, turned to me, with a sharpness which was not necessary, and said, "The hon. member has no objection to make a great empire into a small one, but I have." Perhaps if he lived in the United States, if he were a member of the Senate or House of Representatives there, he would doubt whether it was his duty to consent at once to the destruction of a great country; to its separation, it may be, into two hostile camps; or whether he would not try what means were open to him, and would be open to the government to avert such an unlooked-for and dire calamity. There were other speeches that have been made. I will not refer to them by any quotation. I will not, out of pity to some of the men who have uttered them (laughter)—I will not bring their names even before you, or give to them an endurance which I hope they will not have (hear, hear); but I will leave them in that obscurity which they so richly merit (laughter). But now you know as well as I do, that of all the speeches made at the end of the session of Parliament by public men and politicians, the majority of them displayed either strange ignorance of American affairs, or a strange absence of that cordiality and friendship which, I maintain, our American kinsmen have a right to look for at our hands (hear, hear). And if we part from the speakers and turn to the writers, what do we find there? We find that that journal which is reputed abroad, and has hitherto been reputed at home, as the most powerful representative of English opinion, at least of the richer classes—we find that in that very newspaper there has not been, since Mr. Lincoln took office in March last as President of the United States, one fair, and honorable, and friendly article on American affairs in its columns (hear, hear). Some of you, I dare say, read it (laughter)—but, fortunately, now every district is so admirably supplied with local newspapers, and I trust in all time to come the people of England will drink of purer streams nearer home (cheers and laughter) and not of streams which are muddled by party feeling, political intrigue, and by many motives that tend to anything rather than the enlightenment and advantage of the people.

THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT JUSTIFIED.

I say that, looking at the principles avowed in England, and at all its policy, there is no man that is not absolutely a non-resistant in every sense, who can fairly challenge the conduct of the American government in this war. It is a curious thing to find that the party in this country which on every public question is in favor of war at any cost, when it comes to speak of the duty of the government of the United States is in favor of peace at any price (hear, hear). I want to know whether it has ever been admitted by politicians and statesmen that great nations can be broken up at any time by the will of any particular section of those nations? It has been tried occasionally in Ireland (laughter)—and if it had succeeded, history would have said with very good cause (hear, hear). But if anybody tries now to get up a secession or insurrection in Ireland, it would be less disturbing in everything than the secession in the United States, because there is a boundary which nobody can dispute. I am quite sure *The Times* newspaper would have sent a special correspondent, who would have described glowingly and exultingly the manner in which the Irish insurrectionists were cut down and made an end of. Let any man try in this country to restore the Heptarchy. Do you think that any Minister in this country would think it a thing to be tolerated for a moment? But if you will look at a map of the United States, you will see that there is no country in the world, probably, at this moment, where any plan of separation between North and South, so far as the question of boundary is concerned, is so surrounded with insurmountable difficulties. For example: Maryland is a slave State, but Maryland has by a very large majority voted for the Union. Would Maryland go North or South? Kentucky is a slave State, and one of the finest States in the Union, and containing a fine people. Kentucky has voted for the Union, and has been invaded from the South. Missouri is a slave State. Missouri has not seceded, but has been invaded from the South, and there is a Secession party in that State. There are parts of Virginia which form themselves into a new State, resolving to adhere to the North; and there is no doubt a considerable Northern and Union feeling in the State of Tennessee; and I have no doubt that there is in every other State—indeed, I am not sure that there is not now within the sound of my voice a citizen of the United States (hear)—a citizen of the State of Alabama, who can tell you that there the question of secession has never been put to the vote, and that there are great numbers of most reasonable and thoughtful, just men in the State who entirely deplore the condition of things there existing. Well, then, what would you do with all these States, and with what may be called the loyal portion of the population of these States? Would you allow them to be dragooned into this insurrection, and into the formation of a new State, to which they themselves are hostile? But what would you do with the city of Washington? Washington is in a slave State. Would anybody have advised President Lincoln and his Cabinet, and the members of Congress and the House of Representatives or Senate from the North, with their wives and children, and everybody else who was not in favor of the South—that they should set off on their melancholy pilgrimage Northward, leaving a Capital hallowed by such associations, having its name from the father of their country—would you say that they should travel Northward and leave Washington to the South, because Washington was situated in a slave State? Again, what do you say to the Mississippi river? Have you seen it on the map, the father of waters, rolling that gigantic stream to the ocean—do you think the fifty million who will one day occupy the banks of that river to the Northward—do you think that that great stream should roll through a foreign, and it might be, a hostile State? (Hear, hear, and cheers.) And more, there are four million of negroes in subjection. For them the American Union is directly responsible. They are not secessionists. They are now, as they always were, legally, not subjects nor citizens, but under the care and power of the government of the United States. Would you consent that these should be delivered up to the tender mercies of their taskmasters, the defenders of slavery as an everlasting institution? Well, if all had been surrendered without a struggle, what then? What would the writers in this newspaper and other newspapers have said? If a bare rock in your empire that would not keep a single goat alive be touched by any foreign Power, why the whole empire is aroused to resistance. And if there be, from accident or from passion, the smallest insult to your flag, what do your newspaper writers say on the subject, and what is said in all your towns, and on all your [illegible] said if the government of the United States and the North had taken their insidious and dishonest advice. They would have said that the great republic is a failure, that democracy has murdered patriotism, that history affords no example of such meanness, such cowardice, and they would have heaped unmeasured obloquy and contempt upon the people and the government that had taken that course.

LIBERTY AT THE NORTH—SUSPENSION OF HABEAS CORPUS.

Well, but they tell you—these candid friends of the United States—they tell you that all freedom is gone, that the *habeas corpus* act, if they ever had one, is known no longer, and that any man may be arrested at the dictum of the President or the Secretary of State. In 1848 you recollect, many of you, that there was a small insurrection in Ireland. It was an absurd thing altogether; but what was done then? Why, I saw in one night in the House of Commons, a bill for the suspension of the *habeas corpus* act pass through all its stages. What more did I see? I saw a bill brought in by the Whig government of that day, Lord John Russell being Premier, which made speaking against the government and against the Crown, which up to that time had been sedition, or proposed to make it, felony, and it was only by the greatest exertion of a few members that that Act, with that particular, was limited to a period of two years. In the same session a bill was brought in, called an Alien Act, which empowered the Home Secretary to take any foreigner whatsoever, not a naturalized Englishman, and in twenty-four hours to send him out of the country; and although a man might have committed no crime, this might be done to him apparently on suspicion. But suppose that an insurgent army had been so near London that you could see its outposts from every suburb of London, what then do you think would have been the regard of Great Britain for personal liberty if it interfered with the necessity, and, as they might think, the salvation of the State? (Hear, hear.) I recollect in 1848, when the *habeas corpus* act was suspended, that a number of persons in Liverpool, men there of position and wealth, presented a petition to the House of Commons praying—what? That the *habeas corpus* act should not be suspended? No; they were not content with having it suspended in Ireland, they prayed the House of Commons to extend the suspension to Liverpool (laughter). I recollect at that time—I am sure my friend Mr. Wilson will bear me out in what I say—that the Mayor of Liverpool telegraphed to the Mayor of Manchester, and messages were sent on to London nearly every hour. The Mayor of Manchester heard from the Mayor of Liverpool that certain Irishmen in Liverpool, conspirators and fellow-conspirators with those in Ireland, were going to burn the cotton-warehouses of Liverpool and the cotton mills of Lancashire (laughter). I took that petition from the table of the House of Commons and read it, and handed it over to a statesman of great eminence, who has but just been removed from among us—a man not second to any in the House of Commons for his knowledge of affairs, and great capacity—I refer to the late Sir James Graham—I handed to him this petition; he read it, and after he read it he rose from his seat and laid it on the table with a gesture of abhorrence and disgust (hear, hear). Now, that was a petition from the town of Liverpool, in which some persons had been making themselves ridiculous by their conduct in this matter (cheers).

AMERICAN IRRITABILITY—REASONS FOR IT.

It is a common observation that our friends in America are very irritable. I think that is very likely, as to a considerable number of them, to be quite true. Our friends in America are in a great struggle. There is nothing like it before in their history. No country in the world was ever more entitled, in my opinion, to the sympathy and forbearance of all friendly countries than are the United States at this moment (hear). They have their newspapers that are no wiser than ours (laughter). They have there some newspapers, one at least, which, up to the election of Mr. Lincoln, were his bitterest and unrelenting foes. When the war broke out it was not safe to take the line of Southern support, and they were obliged to turn round in support of the prevalent opinions of the country. But they undertook to serve the South in another way, and that was by exaggerating every difficulty and misstating every fact, if that could serve their object of creating distrust between the people of the Northern States and the people of this United Kingdom. If *The Times* in this country has done all that it could to poison the minds of the people of England, and to irritate the minds of the people of America, the New York *Herald*, I am sorry to say, has done I think all that it could, or all that it dared, to provoke mischief between the government of Washington and the government of London (cheers). There is one thing which I must state where I think they have a solid reason to complain. I am very sorry to have to mention it, because it blames our present Foreign Minister, against whom I am not anxious to say a word, and recollecting his speech in the House of Commons, I should be slow to conclude that he had any feeling hostile to the United States government (hear, hear). You recollect that, during the session, on the 14th of May, a proclamation came out which acknowledged the South as a belligerent power, and proclaimed the neutrality of England. A little time before that, I forget how many days, Mr. Dallas, the last Minister from the United States, had left London for Liverpool and America. He did not wish to undertake any affairs connected with the government by which he had not been appointed—the government of Mr. Lincoln; but to leave what had to be done to his successor, who was on his way, and whose arrival was daily expected. Mr. Adams, the present Minister from the United States, is a man, if he lived in England, you would say was one of the noblest families of the country. I think that his father and his grandfather were Presidents of the United States. His grandfather was one of the great men who achieved the independence of the United States. There is no family in that country having more claims upon what I should call the veneration and affection of the people than the family of Mr. Adams. Mr. Adams arrived in London on the night of the 13th of May. On the 14th, that proclamation to which I have alluded was issued. It was known he was coming; he was not consulted; it was not delayed for a day, though nothing pressed, that he might be notified about it. If communications of a friendly nature had taken place with him and with the American government, they could have found no fault with this, because it was almost inevitable before the struggle had proceeded far that this proclamation would be issued. I have the best reasons for knowing that there is no single thing that has happened during the course of these events that has created more surprise, more irritation, and more distrust in the United States with respect to this country, than the fact that that proclamation did not wait even one single day till the Minister from America could come here, and till it could have been done with his consent and concurrence, and in that friendly manner that would have avoided all the unpleasantness that has occurred (cheers). I am obliged to say—and I say it with the utmost pain—that without this country doing things which were hostile to the North, and without men expressing affection for slavery, and outward and open hatred for the Union—I say there has not been here that cordial and friendly neutrality which, if I had been a citizen of the United States, I should have expected (hear, hear). And I say further, that if there has existed considerable irritation at that, that must be taken as a measure of the high appreciation which the people of those States place upon the opinion of the people of England (hear).

ELOQUENT APPEAL.

Before I sit down I must ask you—What is this people, about which so many men in England at this moment are writing and speaking, and thinking with harshness—I think with injustice—if not with great bitterness? Two centuries ago multitudes of the people of this country found a refuge on the North American continent, escaping from the tyranny of the Stuarts and from the bigotry of Laud. Many noble spirits from our country endeavored to establish great experiments in favor of human freedom on that continent. Bancroft, the greatest historian of his own country, has said in his graphic and emphatic language, "The history of the colonization of America is the history of the crimes of Europe." From that time down to our own period America has admitted

one of them had shot at and killed a negro cook; another shot at an officer, and a third attempted to commit some other violence upon his Lieutenant. The two negroes, on being accused of selling the whiskey to the men, confessed it. The General Orders of the division were that any man, white or black, guilty of such a violation of discipline, should be whipped by the men to whom they had sold the liquor. This order was carried out in this case, the negroes whipped by the soldiers whom they had made drunken, and then turned out of the camp. Such is the statement as now made on authority which has a right to demand a hearing. The difference between this and the former narration is this: that the slaves were not fugitives, but living with their master just outside the camp, and that the punishment awarded them was not unusual, and not an invention of Col. Gorman's, but was, in accordance with the orders of Gen. Stone, the commander of the division, inflicted on all, without regard to color, guilty of the crime in question. It was also alleged that Col. Gorman's sutler was at this very time selling liquor to the men with impunity. But to this part of the charge we have no reply.

We are also assured that Col. Gorman's opinions on the subject of slavery—which were supposed to supply the motive in his conduct in this matter—are entirely misunderstood. He has openly and constantly, we are assured, proposed to leave slavery to take care of itself, refusing to hunt or return fugitive slaves, and giving to the system no tender consideration whatever. The rebellion, he thinks, should be put down at any cost, and he has no disposition to save the system of slavery from that destruction which must follow the prosecution of the war. As this statement is much more honorable to him, and more agreeable to believe, than that which first reached us, we trust it is true.—*Tribune.*

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 18, 1862.

THE TWENTY-EIGHTH

NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY SUBSCRIPTION ANNIVERSARY.

THE ladies who have for so many years received the subscriptions of their friends to the Cause, ask the favor of their company, as usual at this time of the year, on

WEDNESDAY EVENING, the 22d of January, in Music Hall, Boston.

As it is quite impossible for us to send invitations to all, even in this vicinity, *who hate slavery and who desire to aid in its entire abolition, and if possible by moral and peaceful means*, we would say to all the friends of justice and freedom that they may obtain special invitations (without which no party is admitted) at the Anti-Slavery Office, 221 Washington street, Boston, and of the ladies at their respective homes.

L. Maria Child,	Caroline M. Severance,
Mary May,	Mary Willey,
Louisa Loring,	Ann Rebecca Bramhall,
Henrietta Sargent,	Sarah P. Remond,
Sarah Russell May,	Mary E. Stearns,
Helen Eliza Garrison,	Sarah J. Nowell,
Anna Shaw Greene,	Elizabeth Von Arnim,
Sarah Blake Shaw,	Anne Langdon Alger,
Elizabeth Gay,	Eliza Apthorp,
Caroline Thayer,	Sarah Cowing,
Abby Kelley Foster,	Sarah H. Southwick,
Lydia D. Parker,	Mary Elizabeth Sargent,
Augusta G. King,	Sarah C. Atkinson,
Mattie Griffith,	Abby Francis,
Mary Jackson,	Mary Jane Parkman,
Evelina A. Smith,	Georgiana Otis,
Katherine E. Faraum,	Abby H. Stephenson.

☞ The friends of the Cause in distant cities, or in country towns, with whom we have been so long in correspondence, are earnestly entreated, for the sake of the Cause, at this moment of deep and anxious interest—when the unstinted contributions of the whole Northern people to defeat the wicked and rebellious designs of slavery make it difficult to raise money in large sums—*to take up collections* in their respective neighborhoods; using all diligence to make the amount of smaller subscriptions supply any deficiency the times may occasion in the larger ones. *Now* should be the time of our most devoted effort; and abundant opportunities are afforded us for reaching the consciences and hearts of the people, with a power and to a degree never before known. It is hoped that no town, which has ever manifested an interest in the cause of freedom, will be unrepresented now; and that no individual whose heart is in union with ours on this subject will be found wanting to our list. We hope to welcome as many as possible at the evening reception—at all events, to receive their subscriptions by letter.

☞ The Germania Band is engaged, whose beautiful music will add to the attractions of the occasion.

☞ Each invitation must be inscribed with the name of the guest, as last year, before presenting at the door.

☞ Cloaks and shawls may be left in the care of attendants at the entrance.

☞ If, in any case, a donation or subscription cannot be forwarded in season for the Anniversary, it will be included in the list of acknowledgments if sent as soon afterwards as circumstances permit.

TO THE FRIENDS OF THE SLAVE.

WE trust that all those who believe we ought to "remember those in bonds, as bound with them," will bear in mind our Reception at the Music Hall, Jan. 22, and will give us aid, either in person, by proxy, or by letter.

One party is talking of subjugating slaveholders, and another of compromising with slaveholders; but who, except the "old Abolitionists," fully recognizes the rights of the *slave*, and our duty towards *him*, as our brother, in the sight of God? While politicians look at emancipation only as a "necessity of war," and seem to consider colored men and women as so many horses or mules, to be disposed of as may best suit *their* convenience, it is evident that a great moral work still needs to be done, before this guilty nation can be imbued with principles of justice and feelings of humanity toward those whom they have so long oppressed.

Help us to do this righteous work, we pray you.

In behalf of the Committee of Anti-Slavery Ladies,

L. MARIA CHILD.

THE PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR.

THE Twenty-sixth Annual Fair was held in the Large Saloon of the Assembly Buildings, on the 17th, 18th, 19th and 20th of December, 1861.

The Receipts were $1,356.

This sum far exceeds the expectations with which preparations for the sales commenced. Many who have heretofore worked with us in this department of anti-slavery labor have been devoting their time and energies to the clothing and comfort of the soldiers in the armies of the country, to the sick and wounded in the hospitals, or to the destitute slaves who have sought refuge with the foes of their oppressors; therefore, we were agreeably surprised to find so large a number, who, in addition to these labors, could bring their offerings in aid of the organization whose work will not be accomplished till "Liberty shall be proclaimed throughout the land, to *all* the inhabitants thereof."

Valuable donations were received from numerous friends in the city; also from Newtown, Wakefield, Wrightstown, Solebury, Bristol, Byberry, Abington, Upper Dublin, Chelton Hills, Germantown, Norristown, Warwick Furnace, Kimberton, Coventry, Kennett, Longwood, Lancaster Co., Milton, Delaware Co., Wilmington, Mullica Hill, Staten Island, N. Y., and Hingham, Mass.

A generous donation of £20 was received from a friend in London.

It is a great pleasure to report this success of our efforts; the contributions and receipts being much larger than were anticipated. The unusually fine weather, the absence of opposition in the public mind, the throng of sympathizing friends, combined to make the time of the Fair a season of rare social enjoyment and gratification. Though the chains of the slave are not yet broken, the feeling that the time is not far distant when his shackles must fall gave gladness and hope, almost assurance, that our labors would erelong be crowned with success, and the Jubilee song of enfranchised millions unite in the joyful acclaim, "Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace and good will to men."

On behalf of the Committee,

SARAH PUGH, LUCRETIA MOTT,
MARY GREW, MARGARETTA FORTEN.

Philadelphia, January, 1862.

MULTUM IN PARVO.

OUR Philadelphia correspondent spoke well, last week, of the amazing assumptions of H. M., on a previous occasion, that the capture of Mason and Slidell was "an outrage too gross to be endured," and that, without immediate apology and retraction from our government, England would "have no choice" but to declare war against us. Our excellent Dublin correspondent, though expressing himself in a style more *moderately* British, has fallen into a measure of the same unwisdom on the same subject. Admitting that "War is a clumsy expedient for the settlement of national quarrels," he proceeds to say: "I wish some other could be invented." This is really too much like the manner in which our slaveholders (the more moderate of them) assume the imperious necessity for slaveholding. After we have for years been saying to them—Render unto your servants that which is just and equal! Let the oppressed go free! Let each individual democrat cease from the exercise of despotic power! Let each individual church-member act like a Christian to his poor and weak black brother! Let every employer make a fair bargain with his servants, pay them the wages mutually agreed upon while they work for him, and not prevent their going elsewhere to better themselves! After we have for years been presenting to them this simple, immediate and perfect remedy for the monstrous evils of slaveholding, they coolly say: "If you would only give us some *plan* of emancipation!"

When each of the two nations in question has for hundreds of years had in permanent action a system of judicial arbitration and decision for the disputes of individuals (which, whatever its imperfections, is unspeakably better than the taking of arms by those individuals to settle their disputes), it is too late to assume that a substitute for war is yet to be *invented*. The people, both in England and in the *free* States of America, are perfectly satisfied that, in the long run, it is infinitely better for each one to bring his individual disputes to the arbitration of law, and to yield to the decision when it turns against himself, than with force and arms to maintain his own claim against his neighbor. Moreover, there have been many instances of resort to arbitration, and many instances of successful arbitration, between nations; and, on the other hand, the history of wars shows us that they are not at all to be relied upon as means of securing either justice in general, or safety to the oppressed, or reparation to the injured. Nations, like individuals, continue to follow the foolish routine to which they have become accustomed. In their failure to resort to peaceful arbitration for a settlement of their disputes, it is the will, not a method, that is wanting.

War is bad enough in the form in which we have it in this country, forced upon us by the unprovoked attack of professional marauders and brigands, people accustomed to live by plunder, and regardless alike of their own duties and the rights of others. To declare and commence hostilities is appropriate enough for a swearing, whiskey-drinking, slaveholding, horse-racing, cock-fighting people. War is a duel between nations, and our Southrons are eminently a duelling people. All these practices suit each other, and belong to the same grade of barbarism. But England and our Northern States are so far advanced in civilization that better things should be expected and demanded of them. It is no less than utterly abominable for either of these to make war upon the other. It is a shame for either to propose such war, or to prepare for it. We ought, both of us, to have made more progress towards Christianity. But, alas, John Bull has been long accustomed to make war, and Jonathan is a chip of the old block; and there are many in both nations who are moved by spite remaining from old controversies, or by national pride, or by some expected profit to their trade from the uprising of war, to urge war, to represent it as needful and desirable, and unscrupulously to play the braggart and the bully in urging the outbreak of hostilities.

[illegible] among our people, even among Abolitionists, to speak evil of England, to indulge in sarcastic remarks respecting her, to represent her as worse than other nations, and to threaten retaliation for the harsh treatment which she is alleged to be now using towards us.

Through the whole course of history, the governments of nations have been found acting in a selfish manner in the discharge of their public functions. Rulers have almost always shown either a base and sordid selfishness in accumulating wealth and power for themselves, or a refined selfishness in exalting their country at the expense, and to the injury, of other countries. We are not to expect nobleness, generosity, or magnanimity, from governments. We are to expect from the best of them nothing but a worldly expediency, a looking out for the interests of Number One. And surely, our government has not so risen above this level in times past, in the management of its foreign relations, as to be entitled to expect variation from it on the part of others. Not until we set the example of a higher regard for right and justice, and a greater freedom from selfishness than we have ever yet shown, shall we be entitled to demand or expect such liberality from the authorities of England.

Neither is it right to represent Great Britain as worse than other nations in the exercise of this customary selfishness. If, instead of taking in dudgeon the sophistry of Mr. Secretary Seward, she consents to receive as satisfactory that proportion of concession to her late demand which we have just made, it is all we have a right to expect from her. If she shall insist upon our compliance with the whole of that demand, upon the cashiering of Capt. Wilkes, and an apology from our government for his manifestation of zeal in its behalf, and in default thereof should declare war, bad as that would be, it is no worse than our own treatment of the Mexican government, and of the various nations of American Indians, on many previous occasions. It ill suits us to complain of receiving from others the very measure which we have been accustomed to mete to others.

A burst of enthusiastic admiration from the whole North followed the spirited action of Capt. Wilkes. Into the precise merits of that action (about which much is plausibly said on each side) we do not now intend to enter. But, the zeal exhibited by that gallant officer in behalf of his country and his government, and his willingness to run the risk of reprimand to himself rather than lose the opportunity of doing what seemed an important service to his country, being everywhere among us so thoroughly valued and extolled, why should we fail to see that the same regard for the rights, the interests, the honor, dignity and *prestige* of Number One must be equally felt by the English people? Right or wrong, they have certainly been accustomed to think and call Britannia the queen of the seas, and to guard with jealous care those privileges the exercise of which they have so long claimed and used. Perhaps they have claimed and used more than is strictly their due; but the custom of getting what they can and keeping what they get is not so exclusively theirs that they alone, among nations, should be called to account for it. And (considering the extent of our own offences in that kind) the attempt to arrange matters on some better footing had much better be made by calm and deliberate official negotiation, at some period more free than the present from the excitement of prejudice and passion on both sides.

Since, then, the action of the British government (like that of ours) has been only a customary application of the popular maxim that "Charity begins at home"—and since the outcry of their press and people against Capt. Wilkes is at least as *natural* as our outcry in his favor, let us moderate our indulgence in bitter feelings and bitter expressions. Let us cease to rail at England as worse than other nations, and to threaten an equal measure of harsh treatment to her, at some future period of her distress and calamity. Let us cease from pouring out curses, and from meditating revenges. The bullying, bragging, and unmeasured vituperation in which so large a portion of our press are accustomed to indulge have no tendency to help us, and cannot fail to disgrace us. If we have really been wronged, self-possession and dignity are indispensable towards the process of getting righted.

Leaving these British entanglements, as we have said, for calm negotiation in the future, let us now apply ourselves to the one thing needful, the pulling the *great* beam out of our own eyes. Justice, humanity and religion have long called upon us to abolish slavery, but we have hitherto refused. Let us now do it at the call of self-preservation; for nothing else will save us. In vain do we look for help to some possible policy of the European powers; in vain do we look for it to some possible victories of McClellan. If slavery among the rebels is sedulously spared, if slavery among the loyal Southrons is assiduously cherished, this contest *must* remain unfinished, and any present accommodation of the strife *must* prove temporary and delusive. Slavery, if spared, will assuredly continue to work just such fatal evils as it has hitherto wrought; and the quiet acquiescence of the whole country in a renewal of that state of things is an event as utterly impossible as the return of the Mississippi to its source. Even if the profligate conductors of *The Journal of Commerce* in this city and of *The Courier* in Boston could accomplish their desire of replacing every slaveholder in his despotic power, of restoring every fugitive slave, and of hanging every existing Abolitionist, the quiet which they seek could never endure. God is not dead. The recognition of justice, the sentiment of duty, the aspiration after more righteousness and humanity than we have yet attained to have not ceased from the earth. Now, not less than in the time of Jesus, if the existing workers for these should die, or prove faithless, the very stones would cry out; and God would raise up from among Democrats and Hunkers, Re-publicans and sinners, abundance of prophetic voices to cry aloud in the moral wilderness for the removal of this vilest of nuisances, this worst of stumbling-blocks, from the path of civilization and improvement.

The nuisance, the curse, the sin of slaveholding *must* be abolished. The only question for us is, shall *we* seize the short remaining time in which to do this indispensable work, and gain the advantage of doing it, before being cast aside as unprofitable servants, and seeing the vineyard which we have failed to cultivate given to others, who shall bring forth good fruits in their season. The pending question, a fearfully momentous one for us, is whether God is to be served, and his purposes to be answered, by this Northern nation, in the way of example, or of warning. Shall we live, saved, through infinite mercy, by a late repentance and reformation, or shall we die, dashed to pieces, as the Southern oppressors are to be, a monument of his avenging justice, and a warning to all future slaveholders. Long since, the voice of God said to a nation which, in spite of many warnings, persevered in oppression: "Thus saith the Lord; ye have not hearkened to me, in proclaiming liberty, every one to his brother, and every man to his neighbor. Behold, I proclaim a liberty for you, saith the Lord, to the sword, to the pestilence, and to the famine." The pending question now is, Has this voice yet gone forth against *us*, or may immediate reform yet avert our destruction?

For those who are disposed to work, the methods are obvious. Since the President and his chief advisers are obstinately fixed upon persistence in a wrong course, let no time be wasted upon them. Let every member of Congress push, with utmost speed and strength, every practicable method of obtaining an enactment abolishing slavery; let the people send to Congress constant and urgent petitions that this may be immediately done; and let every officer and soldier of the army, and every other man, public or private, who comes in contact with slaves, do his utmost to inform them of their right to liberty, help them in the attainment of it, and give what aid he can towards securing them in the permanent enjoyment of it.

NEW YORK STATE ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

THE Sixth Annual Anti-Slavery Convention for the State of New York will be held in ALBANY, at ASSOCIATION HALL, on FRIDAY and SATURDAY, Feb. 7th and 8th, commencing at 10½ o'clock a.m. Three sessions will be held each day.

The exigencies of the slave's cause, in the present national crisis, call for a full representation at this Convention of the friends of freedom from all parts of the State. During the past year the SLAVE States have dissolved the Federal Union, repudiated the United States Constitution, and organized a gigantic conspiracy in the name of a new confederacy, the chief stone in the corner of which, it is avowed, is HUMAN SLAVERY. The Federal government, which began its career by fatal concessions to slaveholding barbarism, and has since been disgraced and weakened by numerous like concessions, until now its very existence is imperilled by the same aggressive, unscrupulous power, is still administered in a spirit of suicidal submission to the unrighteous dictation of slaveholders. Though there has been a great and most gratifying increase of anti-slavery sentiment since the outbreak of the rebellion, and a strong tide of opposition to slavery is steadily rising among the people of the North, still, in our midst, the enemies of impartial liberty, and of a truly republican government, masked under professions of loyalty, are not a few. It is no time, therefore, for Abolitionists to relax their efforts, but rather is increased fidelity called for. Special earnestness and activity is yet demanded of every friend of freedom and of just government, to secure the speedy abolition of slavery under the war power. The present and future well-being of not only four million of slaves, but of every inhabitant of the land is at stake. The dangerous and fatal spell of submission to slavery must now be broken, the slaves rescued from the vile grasp of traitorous oppressors, and thus, justice having been done, an abiding peace be ensured. Let all who possibly can, come up to the approaching annual Convention, and contribute, by personal presence and wise counsel, to render its influence mighty and effective in the service of the sacred cause of liberty.

[The names of the speakers who will attend the Convention, among whom are confidently expected WM. LLOYD GARRISON, WENDELL PHILLIPS, PARKER PILLSBURY, and THEODORE TILTON, will be announced hereafter.]

In behalf of the Committee of Arrangements,

A. M. POWELL.

MR. GARRISON'S LECTURE.—We have time and space this week only to say, that Mr. Garrison's lecture at the Cooper Institute, on Tuesday evening, upon "The Abolitionists, and their Relations to the War," was a complete success. The audience, though not so numerous as that which lately assembled in the same place to hear Mr. Phillips, was yet large and highly respectable; and what affords special ground of congratulation is the fact that hundreds came who never heard Mr. Garrison before. The speech evidently made a very deep impression, sweeping away old prejudices and misconceptions, and setting the anti slavery cause in a light so clear as to carry conviction to every candid mind. *The Times* and *The Tribune* reported the lecture very fully and fairly, and we shall publish it hereafter, as revised by Mr. Garrison himself.

WENDELL PHILLIPS ON THE WAR.—Mr. Phillips's speech on the War appears in the current number of *The Pulpit and Rostrum*—a periodical designed to preserve the most remarkable sermons, orations, etc., of the time. This speech fills thirty compact, but very neatly printed pages. Published by E. D. Barker 135 Grand street.

NOTICE.—Members of the American Anti-Slavery Society entitled to receive the Annual Report just published will have their copies forwarded by mail upon their remitting the amount of postage (in stamps or otherwise), viz.: *fourteen cents*, to ROBERT F. WALLCUT, 221 Washington Street, Boston.

ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

A LETTER FROM MRS. L. MARIA CHILD.

To the Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

IT was with surprise and regret that I saw in your paper of Dec. 28th the letter of Harriet Martineau. As a private epistle it might have served as "a safety valve to a vexed spirit," and done little mischief. But it was surely injudicious to publish it, at this time, when there is an unhealthy state of excitement on both sides of the Atlantic, occasioned here by a fierce and stubborn rebellion, and there by inconveniences growing out of obstructed commerce.

It is difficult to answer quite dispassionately a letter written in such a spirit as that of your English correspondent; but it is never wise or good to return railing for railing. Let us therefore possess our souls in patience, while we try to inquire candidly how matters really stand between us and England. When this rebellion broke out, no class of people among us either expected or wished that Great Britain should take side in the dispute. But we know that the English had great reverence for government, that they considered rebellions wicked things, and were accustomed to "put them down with an iron hand." We therefore naturally supposed that their sympathies would lean toward our government, in its efforts to preserve national existence; more especially as pillage and outrage were met by sincere attempts at conciliation, and war was accepted as a dire necessity, after those offers had been rejected with scorn and fury. Impartial history will never charge President Lincoln with not having bowed low enough to the rebellious South, in his Inaugural Address; and we supposed that England, distant from the dust of our conflict, would see clearly enough that the South, not the North, was determined to push the country into civil war. The great moral uprising of the English people, resulting in emancipation, had also given us the impression that England was an Anti-Slavery nation. We therefore took it for granted she would have no sympathy with States striving to build a new government, professedly based on the doctrines that one portion of the human family were made to be slaves to the other, that Slavery was morally, socially, and politically, a good institution, and that the African Slave Trade ought to be reopened, as a humanizing and missionary enterprise. We could not suppose that even the haughtiest tories of England would subscribe to the doctrine often announced by our Southern politicians, that "Slavery is the natural and healthy condition of laboring men; without regard to complexion; white or black." Therefore, when the British government announced its neutrality, while we had no fault to find with it, as a measure of national policy, we were disappointed by the cold, unsympathizing tone, which seemed to say, We regard the two contending parties as "six of one and half a dozen of the other." Many inquired whether I was not grieved and surprised at the position taken by England. I answered, "No. Governments, of course, always act from policy, not from principle or feeling. But the good sense of the English people will show them that this war is not merely a strife for sectional power; that it involves a question of life or death with the American people; the question whether they shall have any government or not. It is impossible that the English people can sympathize with States, which shamelessly boast of Slavery as the foundation of their proposed government."

As time passed on, circumstances compelled me to waver in this opinion. Even those among us, who were most disposed to love and honor "the mother country," were obliged to admit that English newspapers, with few exceptions, leaned more and more in favor of "Slave-own-ia." Some of them began to assume a tone so insulting, that no American, who had a particle of love for his country, could read them with equanimity, however mild and candid he might be. We were not called the American people, but "the mob"; and this epithet was applied to that portion of the country still loyal to its government. Let us inquire where rests the blame of the mobbing and lynching, so often brought against us. In the year *preceding* Lincoln's inauguration, seven hundred and twenty-three Northerners were treated with brutal violence at the South. Between forty and fifty of these were murdered; many were tarred and feathered, or cruelly whipped; and still more were imprisoned, and robbed of their money and clothing; and no local authorities interfered for their protection. These victims were not Abolitionists; many of them had been shamefully subservient to the Slave Power. They were school teachers, and traders of various kinds, visiting the South for business purposes. Many of them went to collect debts; and "the chivalry of the South" found it a convenient way of paying, to imprison them, steal the contents of their trunks, and order them to quit in two hours, or be hanged as Abolitionists. While this was going on, Mr. Yancey of Alabama came North to lecture in defence of slavery. Boston offered him Faneuil Hall, the old "Cradle of Liberty," for that purpose. Her notabilities cheered him and feasted him, and those who most detested his doctrines had no disposition to interfere with his freedom of speech. Since the war began, no Northerner has been safe in any of the rebellious States. They have not been allowed to leave, and those who could not escape have been forced to enlist in the rebel army. Some, who found means to desert, testify that some of their Northern companions, who refused to fight against the U. S. government, were tarred, set on fire, and burned to death. At the North, no man has been forced to enlist. Southern rebels are continually sending their wives and children into the Free States, for protection. Their families are in all our towns and cities; and, notwithstanding the exasperated state of popular feeling, I never heard that any person manifested a disposition to persecute them, or to maltreat them in any way. On Southern battle-fields, our wounded and dying have been stabbed. Thirty such poor sufferers, under the protection of a surgeon's flag, were literally hacked and hewed to pieces, while waiting for ambulances to convey them to the hospital. Their surgeon, Dr. Barnes of the 27th New York Volunteers, testifies to this fact; and there are many more like it, testified to by eye-witnesses! A Lieutenant-Colonel of an Alabama regiment was lying wounded on the battle-field. At the approach of some of our troops, he threw up his hands and begged for life. They replied, "We did not come here to fight with wounded men." They took him up, and conveyed him to Sudley Church, which had been converted into a temporary hospital. His wounds were carefully dressed by our surgeons. In the gratitude of his heart, he exclaimed, "Boys, I give you my word of honor that no man in this hospital shall be hurt, while I have a breath of life." The Black Horse Cavalry, composed of the élite of Virginia gentlemen, rode up to the church with the hospital-flag flying over it, and fired into the windows upon the wounded and dying on the floor, and upon the surgeons in attendance. Some who attempted to escape by the door were cut to pieces with sabres. The rebel troops afterward shelled this hospital and burned it to the ground with many of the wounded in it. I know not what was the fate of the grateful Alabamian Colonel. There is abundance of well authenticated evidence that prisoners taken by the rebels have often suffered greatly for food and clothing, and some have been treated with brutal indignity. To the best of my information, the rebels taken prisoners by the U. S. troops have had their comforts reasonably cared for. Those at Fort Warren had clothing sent to them from Boston, when the cold weather came on. At the same time, Massachusetts men imprisoned in Richmond sent us word that they were in a state of suffering destitution, and begged us to send them clothing, and other necessaries of life. Their wants were, of course, liberally supplied by their friends. Thus Massachusetts clothed her own sons imprisoned in Rebeldom, at the same time she was clothing rebel prisoners in her own Commonwealth. Some of the aristocracy of Boston even amplified charity into an elegance of courtesy, by sending baskets of Champagne and grapes to the "Southern gentlemen" in durance at Fort Warren. As for the U. S. government, so great has been its leniency toward the rebels, it has become a popular joke that "the war is to be carried on without hurting anybody." Not a traitor or a spy has been hung or shot. When taken, they have often been allowed to go at large, after taking the oath of allegiance, which oath has been frequently violated.

Yet, in view of all these facts, the newspapers of Great Britain groan and hiss over this "fratricidal war," which is brutalizing *the North!* All the violent enormities of slaveholding rebels, they seem to have passed over to the side of the United States, and then scolded us for committing wrongs, which we have in fact suffered. Perhaps this does not arise so much from hostility, as from a careless indifference to the right and wrong of American affairs; but it is not wonderful that it creates a popular belief here that the good wishes of England go largely with our enemies. There are indeed exceptions, which we gratefully acknowledge. When some exulted that our experiment of self-government had already proved a failure, "a bubble that had burst," Lord John Russell had the candor to remind them that the distractions in America could not be justly ascribed to *republican* institutions, but to an element of *despotism* introduced into their social system, while they were under the government of Great Britain. The American people will not forget Messrs. Cobden, Bright, and Foster, the editor of *The Morning Star*, and others who have manifested a friendly and hopeful disposition toward them, in these times of fiery trial; but they cannot help remembering, for generations, that the British press in general occupied itself with ringing the changes through all variations of contempt, reproach, and evil augury. There has been such alertness in prophesying the ruin of our republic, that it looks as if "the wish were father to the thought." In corroboration of this surmise, comes the avowal of Lord Shaftesbury: "I, in common with almost every English statesman, sincerely desire the rupture of the American Union. We justly fear the commercial and political rivalry of the United States. If not checked, they will soon overshadow Great Britain." If this statement be true, it is deeply to be regretted. In view of the peculiar advantages, which God has bestowed upon England and America, there ought to be no rivalry between them, except in good words and works for the benefit of all mankind.

In complaining of the English press, I desire not to be one-sided. The tone of our own papers has in general been undeniably bad. Repudiation of debts due in the South, savage treatment to Northern travellers, robbery of the U. S. treasury, the taking of Fort Sumter with insults to the national flag, had exasperated the people to a great degree. In that excitable state of feeling, the fact that England appeared to place them on the same moral level with the rebels who had done them so much wrong, irritated them, I think, more than the occasion called for. The tone of our papers became unreasonably bitter. This provoked sneers and sarcasm from England. Arrogance and insolence on their part excited bullying and blustering on ours; and so we have gone on from bad to worse. It is an unmanly course, not worthy of either of us, and the sooner it ceases, the better. The fact is, the people of the two countries are in many respects alike. The principal difference between us is that England has the overweening pride that prosperous old folks are apt to have, and we have the overweening vanity which is apt to be the besetting sin of prosperous young folks. The lion is prompt to shake his mane in wrath, and the eagle is quite as ready to bristle up all his feathers in defiance. This tendency to show fight indicates too great pre-dominance of animal instinct in both of us. As the world grows in wisdom, we shall perhaps find a better way to settle disputes.

With shame and sorrow, I also confess that the United States has, in some respects, deserved the reproach and censure of foreign nations. The unjust and unfeeling policy pursued toward a cruelly oppressed class unavoidably chilled the moral enthusiasm, which our cause would have naturally excited in the liberals of all countries. So long as the officers of the U. S. army disgraced their manhood by sending back fugitive slaves to their masters, and the government permitted that mean and wicked business to go on unrebuked, I felt that we had no right to claim the sympathy of the civilized world. But while a sense of justice compelled me to admit this, I could not understand why England should seem to regard us with *less* favor, than she did the Rebel States, who demanded the extension and perpetuity of Slavery, and the reopening of the Slave Trade.

We have been reproached, and I think justly, with our blindness and want of moral courage in not resorting to emancipation. But has England, in view of her own example, any right to despise or condemn us? Let history answer. In 1775, Lord Dunmore was Governor of Virginia. As a means of extinguishing rebellion in the American Colonies, he issued a proclamation, calling to his standard "all indentured servants, negroes and others, appertaining to the rebels," accompanying the call with a promise of freedom. This proceeding filled Gen. Washington with consternation. He wrote to Richard Henry Lee that Lord Dunmore would become "the most formidable enemy of America"; that "unless some expedient could be hit upon to convince the slaves and servants of the impotency of his designs, his strength would increase faster than a snow-ball by rolling." The rebels accordingly drove Lord Dunmore on ship-board, and took great pains to make the negroes believe that he wanted to entice them to his standard merely to sell them into the West Indies. Both humanity and enlightened policy would have led Great Britain to sustain the Governor's proclamation; and if she had done so, she would probably have subdued her insurgent colonies. But a large portion of the wealthy slaveholders were tories, who sought shelter from the revolutionary storm in British camps and cities. The supposition is that they remonstrated against Lord Dunmore's proclamation, as endangering their human property; and, in order to secure *their* continued allegiance, the British government refrained from pursuing the policy so much dreaded by Gen. Washington. The sagacious Governor was no longer entrusted with civil or military power in the colonies. The "Union slaveholders" of that day carried their point, and the rebels conquered. Is not the U. S. government pursuing the same policy that the British government did, and for precisely the same reasons? To be sure, we are living more than two-thirds of a century later, and have her example before us as a warning.

I have no wish to excuse the great moral delinquencies of my beloved country; but surely candid European observers will make some allowance for the difficulties of our government, tangled as it is by its complicated relations with Slavery; and they must also perceive that we are making some progress in the right direction. The popular tide of sympathy with our "contraband" brothers deepens and widens daily; no previous Congress is worthy to be compared with the present for manifestations of right feeling and moral courage on this subject; and even the government, perhaps not against its will, yields gradually to the pressure of a growing public opinion, which it knows to be founded in justice and humanity, and which it is partially persuaded may indicate the wisest policy.

But I have not yet alluded to the capture of the author of the infamous Fugitive Slave Bill, and his rebel companions, whom Mrs. Martineau, with dainty phraseology, styles "Southern gentlemen."

World-famous is Virginia's chivalry, we know;
They're gentlemen of *breeding*, as human shambles show.

Your English correspondent is less velvety in the terms she applies to Capt. Wilkes. His capture of the "Southern gentlemen" is stigmatized as "piratical audacity." Let us compare notes with England on this subject. Capt. Wilkes, unauthorized by the U. S. government, but zealous to serve his country, and believing himself to be acting in conformity with the law of nations, took from Her Majesty's ship the Trent two active and malignant rebels against the government of the U. S. going to Europe for the well-known purpose of seeking the aid of foreign governments to ruin their own. He did not take the Trent into port for adjudication of the case, because the passengers urged upon him the great inconvenience that would be occasioned by such delay. This is decided to have been a mistake; but the informality had its origin in courtesy. That he had no wish to insult Her Majesty of England is sufficiently proved by his unwillingness to put her subjects to any unnecessary inconvenience, in what he deemed the discharge of a duty to his country. The course pursued by Capt. Wilkes, open as it is to the charge of legal informality, gave to all on board the Trent, except the American rebels, all they could have obtained by the most favorable decision of a prize-court, without any of the delay and expense of awaiting such a trial. Piracy is defined as "robbery on the high seas"; but Capt. Wilkes, instead of robbing the Trent, relinquished his chance of obtaining prize-money, and this he did from motives of kindness and courtesy.

Are the hands of England so very clean in this matter, that her writers have a right to denounce legal informality on our part with such exceeding acrimony? I have before me the depositions of numerous American seamen. They were taken under oath, before magistrates, and duly recorded. From this evidence I will select two specimens. Isaac Clark, born in Randolph, Mass., testifies as follows: "On the 14th of June, 1809, I was impressed and forcibly taken from the ship Jane, of Norfolk, by sailing-master of His Majesty's ship Porcupine, Robert Elliot, commander. I had a protection from the custom-house in Salem, which I showed to Capt. Elliot. He swore I was an Englishman, tore my protection to pieces before my eyes and threw them overboard, then ordered me to go to work. I told him I did not belong to his flag and would not work under it. He ordered my legs to be put in irons. Next morning, he ordered the master-at-arms to take me on deck and give me two dozen lashes; to keep me in irons afterward, and give me one biscuit and a pint of water for twenty-four hours. After keeping me in this situation for a week, I was again ordered to go to work, and upon my refusing, he tied me up and gave me two dozen more. I was kept on the same allowance another week. As I still persisted that I was an American, and he had no right to my services, he gave me two dozen more lashes, and ordered a very heavy chain to be put round my neck and fastened to a ring bolt in the deck. No person except the master-at-arms was allowed to speak to me, or to give me anything to eat or drink, except my one biscuit and a pint of water for twenty-four hours. I was kept in this situation nine weeks, when, being exhausted by hunger and thirst, I was obliged to yield." This man was compelled to serve in the British navy more than two years and a half. He was severely wounded in an action with a French frigate, and while in the hospital succeeded in obtaining his release by aid of the American Consul. He testified that there were several impressed Americans on board the same ship.

James Tompkins, born near Poughkeepsie, New York, bound homeward in the ship Minerva, April 1812, was seized, with three other American seamen, and taken on board the British ship Acteon, David Smith, captain. They refused to enter the service. He testifies: "We were then whipped, each five dozen lashes. Wednesday, two days after, we again refused and were again whipped four dozen lashes each. The Saturday following, we still refused, and were whipped three dozen lashes each. On Monday following, we were again whipped two dozen lashes each. On Wednesday following, we were again whipped, one dozen each, and ordered to be taken below and put in irons. The captain said he would punish the damned Yankees till they did consent to enter the service. We laid in irons three months." After a time, the ship went to London, where they obtained release by aid of the American Consul, and a captain who knew them. The magistrate who took his deposition testifies that the scars occasioned by the irons were then visible on his wrists.

Our vessels were neutral, and yet, in spite of earnest representations on the subject, there never was any resort to adjudication to ascertain whether the impressed seamen were American citizens, or British subjects. After ten years of unavailing remonstrance, we at last declared war. The Prince Regent, then ruler in England, published a manifesto on the subject, in which he maintains "the undoubted right of searching neutral vessels in time of war"; and denies that the impressment of British seamen on board such vessels "can be considered by any neutral State as a hostile measure, or a justifiable cause of war." With royal indifference to the wrongs of such an obscure class as sailors, the Prince goes on to say: "If similarity of language and manners makes the exercise of this right more liable to partial *mistakes* and occasional *abuse*, when practised toward vessels of the U. S., the same circumstances make it also a right with the exercise of which, in regard to such vessels, it is more difficult to dispense."

I rejoice in the pacific policy of our government with regard to Messrs. Mason and Slidell. When the fierce threatenings of England reached my ears, I said, "This is a purely legal question, for lawyers and statesmen to settle. If we have violated international law, we ought to acknowledge it; if we have not, let England hold her peace. It would be worse than foolish for two enlightened nations to go to blowing out each others brains on such a question." The courteous and friendly letter of M. Thouvenel convinced me that the proceedings on board the Trent were, in form, a violation of the law of nations. To acknowledge a mistake is always manly and dignified, whether in nations or individuals. The English press has been more angry and insulting on this question, than was either useful or becoming. In assuming that the American people were "a mob," incapable of being amenable to law or reason, they greatly mistake the character of that portion of the country with which they seemed so eager to rush into war. The people of the Free States are a remarkably law-abiding people. There have been very few mobs in this country, except those which were instigated by Slavery.

The official communications of the British government, on the subject of the Trent, were calm and respectful. But the laying down an *ultimatum*, in the very *first* dispatch, suggestive of an immediate resort to "the *last* argument of kings," seemed rather extraordinary. Still more so were the active preparations for war, which were made before the dispatch could reach our government. These things seemed to imply that war with us was a "foregone conclusion," and that a plausible pretext had been anxiously waited for. But perhaps it was not so. It may be it was a temporary whirlwind, excited by individuals and parties, whose interest it is to promote misunderstanding between the two countries. I trust it will be our care, if England does make war upon us, that she shall clearly show herself in the wrong by so doing.

Mrs. Martineau reproaches us with ingratitude to England for her long "forbearance" with us. This puzzles me. Is it her forbearance in not breaking the blockade, for which we ought to be grateful? That cannot be; for Mrs. Martineau herself complains of it as an insult that some Americans have suggested the possibility of England's thus violating the universally-received law of nations. Is it forbearance with the pertness and sauciness of our newspapers? Methinks their own press have amply avenged such attacks, and that the Rolands are not much superior to the Olivers. For the impressment of thousands of our seamen, without judicial process, we did not declare war with England till after *ten years* of unavailing remonstrance. When one of our naval officers took two rebel Americans from a British ship, we received *one* remonstrance, in the form of a demand for immediate restit

MEETING AT WORCESTER.

To the Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

THE Annual Meeting of the Worcester County (South Division) Anti-Slavery Society was held in Worcester on Saturday evening, Jan. 4th, and Sunday, day and evening, Jan. 5th. On account of the sudden severity of the weather, the attendance was not as large as could have been desired; still it was quite respectable, and the audiences were of the most interested and attentive character, so that the meeting was one of hopeful encouragement to the members and friends of the Society.

The absence of the venerable President, JOSIAH HENSHAW (detained by family illness), whose customary presence has heretofore aided and cheered the younger workers, was noticeably felt by the other members as was also the absence of SAMUEL MAY, Jr. (unavoidably detained by business), who for more than twenty years has hardly before been absent from our annual gatherings.

The chair was occupied by JAMES A. WHIPPLE one of the Vice-Presidents, and the time of the various sessions was occupied by earnest addresses and discussions from Parker Pillsbury, Charles L. Remond, Stephen S. and Abby K. Foster, and Joseph A. Howland. The proslavery character of the government and its subordinates in their position and conduct of the present war was properly criticised, and while the speakers urged the duty and necessity of immediate emancipation, all united in denouncing any call for emancipation predicated upon the selfish issue of safety to the whites or to the government, as also any scheme that proposes to compensate or to give a "fair pecuniary award" to those mythical personages, the "loyal slaveholders," as in violation of our fundamental principles and ancient testimonies, that have so long demanded unconditional emancipation as a measure of justice to the slave, a slight recognition of his God-given rights, and a denial of the right of property in man. The duty of the nation to repent of and put away her great sin, *because* of its sin, without waiting for her dire necessities to compel the righteous act, was clearly and forcibly set forth; and the fear was expressed that the duty of repentance and reform might come too late to save the nation from the doom of utter destruction which its fearful guilt merits.

Quite a number of resolutions were offered and discussed, and the following were adopted:

Resolved, That there is nothing in the present aspect of our public affairs to warrant any abatement of our zeal and efforts in the anti-slavery cause. On the contrary, although the times are full of hope, they are also full of the most imminent peril to the interests of both races, and demand of us the utmost vigilance and the most untiring efforts for the unconditional and entire eradication of that root of national bitterness which is the ultimate cause and only substance of the present alarming rebellion.

Resolved, That it is a sad and dangerous mistake to suppose with Mr. Everett and other prominent statesmen, that this stupendous rebellion is the result of sectional pride or disappointed ambition. On the contrary, it has manifestly sprung from no such temporary or arbitrary cause, but is the result of two distinct and necessarily conflicting states of society, one of which must inevitably waste and eventually destroy the other. Hence every attempt on our part to end the war without exterminating the Slave Power or acknowledging the independence of the Confederate States, exhibits a degree of mental stupidity and moral blindness alike derogatory to the head and heart of a civilized community.

Resolved, That the proposition which is made by some to compensate the loyal slaveholders in case of the abolition of slavery by the Federal government, makes it imperative on us to renew the testimony which we have uniformly borne for more than a quarter of a century against compensated emancipation, as a practical recognition of the right of property in man; as a dangerous precedent of compounding with felony; as grossly unjust to the innocent parties who must necessarily be taxed to reward the guilty; as a gratuity to those who sacrifice no real interest, pecuniary or otherwise; and as imposing additional burdens upon the country already overwhelmed with debt, for the benefit of those, who, equally with all other slaveholders, have nourished and sustained that system which is the guilty cause of all our national troubles.

The following were chosen as officers for the ensuing year:

President—JOSIAH HENSHAW, of West Brookfield.

Vice-Presidents—Samuel May, Jr., Leicester; Adin Ballou, Milford; Moses Sawin, Southboro'; Adeline H. Howland, Worcester; Clark Aldrich, Upton; Moses Buffum, Oxford; Adams Foster, Holden; James A. Whipple, Worcester.

Treasurer—Sarah E. Wall, Worcester.

Auditor—Alfred Wyman, Worcester.

Secretary—Joseph A. Howland, Worcester.

Executive Committee—Abby Kelley Foster, Sarah F. Earle, Sarah M. Whipple, Isaac Mason, Worcester; Abijah Allen, Esek Pitts, Millbury; E. D. Draper, Milford; Maria P. Fairbanks, Millville; Nancy B. Hill, Blackstone; Sylvester C. Fay, Southboro'; William Doane, Charlton.

It was voted to request the publication of the proceedings in *The Liberator* and STANDARD.

JAMES A. WHIPPLE, Vice-President.

JOSEPH A. HOWLAND, Secretary.

PERSONAL.

William H. Hurlbert, formerly connected with the New York *Times*, has been released from confinement in Richmond, where he has been held since last June, on the charge of being a spy of the U. S. government.

The Hutchinson Family (John, and his wife and children, we presume) have got a pass to cross the Potomac, and to spend a month singing in the camps. What a treat for the soldiers?

Hon. George S. Hillard, in the course of a recent lecture at Roxbury, Mass., deplored the absence of great men, in these days, from the management of public affairs, when one of the audience suggested Gov. Andrew as an exception. The man was hissed.

Ira Aldridge, the negro tragedian is performing with much success in the cities and towns of Russia. His personation of Othello at Odessa so affected the audience that at the end of the third act they rose *en masse*, and the ladies wept and waved their handkerchiefs.

James Foster Otis, a native of Newburyport, was one of the signers of the Declaration of Sentiments of the American Anti-Slavery Society in 1833, and the only one of their number, so far as we know, that ever openly apostatized from the cause. We have before us as we write a warm eulogium upon Mr. Garrison, delivered by Mr. Otis before the Portland Anti-Slavery Society in 1833. In 1835, when the storm of mobocracy fell upon the heads of the Abolitionists, he openly renounced the faith and went over to the enemy. For a long time afterwards he was connected with that dirty pro-slavery paper, the New York *Express*, in which he embraced every opportunity to libel his former associates. A few years since, he went to New Orleans, where he was employed as assistant editor of *The Picayune*, in which his hatred of the Abolitionists was often exhibited for the edification of his Southern friends. When the Rebellion broke out, however, he did not join in it as readily as might have been expected, and notwithstanding his previous subserviency to the slaveholders, he has been thrust into prison as a suspicious person! What an insatiable tyrant is Slavery, tolerating no dissent from his decrees even in those who have served him for years with a willing mind!

On Sunday morning last, Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, after notifying his congregation of Mr. Garrison's lecture, made the following generous observations:

"The lecture will be on a rather novel subject for Mr. Garrison: that is to say, on Abolitionism, the Abolitionists, and their Relations to the War. Probably, outside of the Indians, there is not a man, woman or child on this continent who has not heard that man's name, and heard it cursed. If there ever was a man who, by other men's speeches, has been set upon and trodden down into the mire, it is William Lloyd Garrison. It seems a little unmanly for me to speak in his favor now, when all the community are beginning to have some sense of that heroism which has sustained him against the most violent public opinion, in the Church and out of the Church, in the State and out of the State, for more than forty years. I recollect that twelve or thirteen years ago, when Abolitionism was not so popular as now, and when no man thought it right to express a dislike of slavery, without first preparing the ear by cursing the Abolitionists—I recollect that at that far-away period, I took occasion, much to the distaste of many of you (for then you were in a very different state of mind from that in which you are now, on this subject), to say that I thought this man heroic; that I admired him all the more because I did not agree with his extreme methods. I agree with Mr. Garrison in the life-long hatred that he holds toward every form of oppression. I agree with him in every letter and punctuation of his belief, that the Bible abhors slavery, from end to end. I agree wholly with him in this, that every man who is a man, ought to give whatever influence he has, of head, and heart, and money, and power, to the extinction of slavery. In regard to the practical modes and instruments by which slavery is to be reached and extinguished, and almost only in that regard, have I had occasion to differ from Mr. Garrison. But after all, differences among men as to the mere methods of carrying out principles are nothing in comparison with the value of the principles themselves. This man has stood fearless and faithful amid universal defections for many years; but the days are soon coming when men will mention his name only with praise."

Our European Correspondence.

LONDON, Dec. 24th, 1861.

IN my last I communicated to you the tidings of the death of the husband of our Queen. Yesterday (I quote from *The Times* of to-day) the grave closed over all that was left us of the accomplished and amiable Prince who has for twenty years discharged the duties of his exalted position in a manner to defy detraction and silence envy itself. Around his coffin there gathered together all that is most illustrious, most venerable, and most powerful in the country. Several prelates, especially distinguished as the leaders of our ecclesiastical hierarchy, many royal Princes and their representatives, the ministers to whom the destinies of the country and the honor of the Crown are entrusted, were assembled to mourn the loss of one whose exalted rank was among the least of his titles to our esteem, and who did not leave behind him, in all that brilliant crowd, any one who had discharged the duties of life with more exemplary or unswerving steadiness than himself. The day was still and gloomy, as befitted the sorrowful occasion, and the melancholy trappings of woe, the long train of plumed horses and mourning coaches, lost on this occasion the impression of emptiness which is too apt to attach to such exhibitions of material sorrow, and were slight, but still fitting accompaniments to the deep and sincere grief which was felt in every heart as for a domestic calamity. But this sad scene was only a specimen of what took place over the whole surface of busy, bustling England. Shops were shut, labor was suspended, Exchanges were closed, and the country voluntarily imposed upon itself a fine which, probably, cannot be estimated at less than a million sterling, in order to mark its regret for the dead and its sympathy for the survivors. A country which can thus mourn deserves to be thus served. We have buried our dead out of our sight with a grief as sincere as unostentatious; but his memory will live among us, and his name will always come first to the lips of those who wish to describe the union of the highest rank with the purest virtue.

I have been informed that amongst the last words uttered by the Prince whose place is now vacant was the expression of an earnest hope that there might be no war between England and the United States. May this hope be realized. May the sentiment of the dying man penetrate the hearts and influence the actions of those to whom attaches the dread responsibility of controlling our relations with foreign countries. There is no room to doubt that the agents of the slaveholding rebels of your Southern States have sown their gold broadcast over the face of England, and that this seed has come up in the form of a harvest of diatribes against the North, and the most astounding misrepresentations of everything pertaining to the objects of your civil war and the motives of your public men. I blush for my country when I read the malignant articles which daily teem from the corrupted press around me, and am ready to exclaim—"Am I in England, and is this really a nation calling itself Christian?"

On the evening of Thursday, the 19th inst., the public of the metropolis were invited by advertisements in all the papers to attend at St. James's Hall, Piccadilly, to listen to a lecture on the American Question, by an American gentleman. The invitation ran as follows:

THE WAR IN AMERICA.—COLONEL FULLER (late Editor of the New York *Mirror*, author of the "Belle Brittan Letters," and "Sparks from a Locomotive"), at the request of several American and English gentlemen, will deliver an ADDRESS on the Causes and Consequences of the Civil War in America, at ST. JAMES'S HALL, Regent street, on THURSDAY EVENING, December 19th. Doors open at a Quarter before Eight, to commence at Half past Eight. Sofa stalls, 4s.; balcony, 2s 6d.: area, 1s.

In addition to the advertisements, visits were paid by Colonel Fuller to all the newspaper offices, to induce the Editors and managers to insert ready-made paragraphs, laudatory of the Colonel, illustrative of the magnitude and importance of the question—but all dexterously concealing the object of the proposed lecture—the glorification of the South, the abuse of the North, and the justification of conspiracy, disunion, treason and slavery. With all appliances and means to boot, the Colonel's audience was, in respect of numbers, contemptible. Secession, however, was appropriately represented in the person of Mr. Yancey, accompanied by some twenty or thirty Americans of his own school, who were the only persons who listened to the lecturer with any other feelings than those of disgust. The following notice of this pro-slavery performance appeared in *The Star and Dial* of the following morning.

COLONEL FULLER IN DEFENCE OF SLAVERY AND SECESSION.

A native of New England—a descendant of the Pilgrim Fathers—a disciple of Daniel Webster—and an editor for twenty-five years of a New York daily paper—Colonel Fuller is, nevertheless, an unqualified advocate of slavery and secession. The address which he last night delivered to a very small audience in St. James's Hall, began with an artful allusion to the affair of the Trent, ended with an absurdly fulsome eulogy on Queen Victoria, and was throughout an almost insulting experiment on the patience of English hearers. Despite repeated protests, by way of reply to indignant expressions of dissent, that he was stating facts, not uttering opinions, the Colonel's address was utterly destitute of novelty in statement—though a very daring novelty in argument and spirit, on this side the Atlantic. There is certainly nothing original in the primary and leading idea of his lecture—that the traders of Massachusetts differ as radically from the "gentlemen" of South Carolina as did the Roundheads from the Cavaliers. We English are accustomed to that idea, and to argue from it that the Cavalier element may be as effectually repressed by the sword of McClellan as by the sword of Cromwell. Neither is there any novelty in the Colonel's second position—namely, that the differences of climate, race, and commercial interest, which have allowed the Union to exist for seventy years, might have allowed it to last another seventy, but for "abolitionism." On this point there seemed entire agreement between the lecturer and his audience; but it was a point of returnless departure. As the real intent of the lecture became manifest, interruptions became so frequent that the speaker had to beg of his (American) friends not to applaud, lest his (English) opponents should get further excited. A secession movement presently set in, and the very select audience that remained was tolerably acquiescent. The Colonel was allowed to dilate in comparative peace on the tranquil happiness of the slaves and their owners—the misery of the forty thousand colored victims of abolitionism who "shiver in the icy paradise" to which they have been conducted by the underground railroad, and long for the "old plantation"—the hypocrisy of Freesoilism and the blasphemous wickedness of John Brown's eulogists—the sublime enthusiasm of the South in defence of the palmetto flag, their honest intention of paying for the Federal property they have appropriated, and their scrupulous forbearance from capturing the Capital. Incidentally, it was mentioned that the recognition of the Confederacy would involve the establishment of an English embassy in the delightful city of Nashville, and in society much more polished than that collected by the ex-rail-splitter at the White House. The duello was also defended as a wholesome corrective to manly freedom of speech, and even to feminine love of scandal—the ladies being made responsible through their male relatives or friends. This was argued with the same seriousness as the culminating theme of the lecture—namely, the infinite advantages of an enlightened despotism over a democratic republic. A restricted suffrage was declared to be the great necessity of America—and the vote which preferred Barabbas a permanent type of the *vox populi*. The open utterance of these sentiments, and their marked favor with the occupants of high priced seats, are political phenomena worthy of regard. If Colonel Fuller will publish the manuscript from which he read last night, the public will see the latest form of doctrine that is approved by the fashionable politicians who desire to ally England with the South. What unfashionable politicians think of it would probably have been made manifest at the close of the lecture, if the chairman—we regret to name Dr. Charles Mackay—had not prohibited discussion because ladies were present; and an organ performance of "God save the Queen" been substituted for the usual vote of thanks. Certainly, loyal Americans have much reason to be grateful to Colonel Fuller for his mirror of the civil war.

As a set-off against the lecture of the Secessionist Colonel, the papers which inserted the advertisement given above, also contained the following:

THE SOUTHERN REBELLION IN THE UNITED STATES.

WHERE SHOULD ENGLAND STAND UPON THE QUESTION? GEORGE THOMPSON, Esq. (late M. P. Tower Hamlets), will deliver an ORATION on the above subject at SURREY CHAPEL, on FRIDAY EVENING, DECEMBER 20, 1861.

The Rev. NEWMAN HALL, LL.D., will take the Chair at Eight o'clock.

Tickets, 6d. each; Reserved Seats, 1s.

I send you a notice of this lecture taken from *The Star and Dial* of the next day. It is the merest outline of the discourse delivered, but sufficient to convey an idea of its scope and object. A good many Americans were present, but they were of a very different stamp from those who bestowed their patronage upon the orator of the West End, and greeted the sentiments of the speaker with applause.

On the evening of the 18th inst., Mr. Thompson delivered a lecture upon the American Crisis in the Assembly Room of the Free Trade Hall, Manchester. It was the first of a course of six lectures which that gentleman has been requested to deliver upon the causes and consequences of the rebellion in the United States, and its probable effects upon the future relations, commercial and political, of Great Britain and America. The chair was occupied by John Cheetham, Esq., late member for the County of Lancashire, and President of the Cotton Supply Association. The Mayor of the city had a seat upon the platform. The lecturer traced the history of slavery in the States of America, from its introduction, seven generations ago, to the present time. The compromises of the Constitution, and their nature, were explained; the growth and ultimate ascendancy of the Slave Power were vividly portrayed; as, also, the long subserviency and guilty complicity of the North. The progress of abolitionism was described—from that "lone chamber" where, "friendless and alone,"

"Toiled o'er his types one poor unlearned young man,"

to the period when volunteer troops, bound to the South, sung the praises of Old John Brown as they marched through the streets of New York. The growth of political anti-slavery was noticed, from its earliest development in the Convention at Warsaw, N. Y., in 1889, to the triumph of the Republican party in 1860, as manifested in the platforms of the Third party, the Liberty party, the Free Soil party, the Free Democracy, the Philadelphia Republican platform, the Chicago platform, and the election of Mr. Lincoln by the popular vote, and the decision of the Electoral Colleges. Mr. Thompson answered the question—"Why had the North taken up arms to overcome the South?" He referred to the extension of slavery over half a million of square miles since the period of the Union—the violation of the Organic Ordinance of 1784 and 1787—to the piratical acquisition of Texas—the instigation of the war with Mexico—the Fugitive Slave law—the seizure, imprisonment and sale of colored seamen—the despotism and ferocity of slaveholding members of Congress—the brutal and murderous attack on Senator Sumner—the Repeal of the Missouri Compromise—the infamous Dred Scott decision—the bloody atrocities in Kansas—the Programme of the Secessionists—the treason of Buchanan's Cabinet—the disunion of the States—the Constitution of the Confederates—the army brought against the Capital, etc., etc. As between the North and the South, no man, understanding the merits of the question, could be neutral. Not to give our sympathies to the North was to be false to the cause of freedom, and to be on the side of slavery. He trusted that one good result of the death of the Prince Consort would be, the bringing about of a more sober and thoughtful state of feeling in this country. Sure he was, that, if the cold lips of the royal corpse in Windsor Castle could speak, they would counsel the people to put away passion, prejudice and pride—to leave off the language of taunt, menace and insult, and to remit to reason and justice the adjustment of existing differences between England and her kinsmen on the opposite shores of the Atlantic. Mr. Thompson's address occupied more than two hours and was loudly applauded throughout.

Our Washington Correspondence.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 13, 1862.

THERE is a strong disposition in Congress to look very sharply into the expenditures of the government. As two million a day are spent, *and nothing is done*, Congress becomes very critical as to *the way* the public monies are disbursed. In the Senate, the Naval Committee report against permitting Mr. Welles to have the building of the new iron-clad gunboats, or rather report against permitting him to give out the contracts for the same, because he selected a brother-in-law to purchase ships for the government. No man for one moment impeaches the integrity of the Secretary, but the act is regarded by his Congressional critics at least as a blunder. In the House, the fact that the American Bank Note Company got the printing of the Treasury Notes, as is alleged, without competition and at high prices, led the Committee of the Whole to strike out the entire section making an appropriation for the printing of the notes. This was a mistake, for a large part of the appropriation is for signing the notes and bringing them before the people for consumption. But the rejection of the section shows the temper of the House on this subject. "Nothing doing," everybody exclaims, "and money going like water. Let us, if we can do nothing else, at least look out for the contract-jobbers!" Richardson of Illinois remarked in the House, "I believe we can put the rebellion down, but I fear the thieves who are plundering the Treasury will be too much for us—they will bankrupt the nation before we can beat the rebels."

This debate upon the alleged frauds practiced upon the Treasury, at this time, will not have a good effect upon the credit of the government. The people are growing doubtful and anxious. They hear a great many wild stories about corruption in high places, and seize upon these corroboratory allegations by members of Congress as complete evidence of the dishonesty of a large number of persons connected with the government.

It is unfortunate, doubtless, at this juncture, to have such discussions take place, but how can they be avoided? With nothing doing by the army, and a general distrust all over the country of the men who conduct the war, it is next to impossible to stifle the most free debate and criticism of persons and measures in Congress. Doubtless in many cases, where suspicions of dishonesty have been indulged, injustice has been done to the parties, and, in the course of time, they will be proved innocent; but just at present suspicion attaches to a great number of persons in and around the government.

There is a way out of this trouble. Let the knaves who cling to the Treasury be swept away, and let the army go forward. Just so long as the army does nothing will Congress and the country look into the conduct of the war, and criticise, with almost hostile vigilance, any actions of the members of the government which savor of corruption or imprudence.

In the Senate, the case of Mr. Stark, of Oregon, who is an applicant for the seat of Baker, has attracted much attention. Stark belonged to that class of Northern politicians who were "opposed to coercion," and whose sympathies have been and still are with the rebel-slaveholders and not with the government. Voluminous evidence has been sent here by some of the most reliable people of Oregon to show that this Stark has been an open-mouthed rebel—that he has repeatedly declared his sympathy for the rebel cause during the past summer, while Baker, whose vacant seat he now desires to fill, was fighting the battles of his country and government. This Stark was appointed to fill the vacancy by the Governor of Oregon, and the appointment only holds good till the Oregon Legislature can elect a man to the place. The case has been referred to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, who will report upon the law and the facts in the case. If Stark is in fact a rebel-sympathiser, it is to be hoped that he will be defeated in his attempt to take several thousand dollars from the government in the shape of pay and mileage. During the discussion Vallandigham of the House came in and watched the proceedings very closely. If rebel-sympathisers are to lose their seats in the Senate, maybe his seat will soon be in danger in the House! Bright, too, was evidently interested, though the Committee in his case has reported in his favor. They find nothing upon which to found a charge of actual disloyalty. Mr. Sumner has been speaking a good deal this week—taking that prominent part in the proceedings of the Senate to which his talents entitle him. His speech on the Trent affair was very able and was listened to with breathless attention by a large audience. When it is remembered that it was a legal argument for the most part, it will be seen that the compliment paid to Mr. Sumner by the very large gallery audience was an unusual one. The French Minister, who listened to the argument to its close, was the first man to congratulate Mr. Sumner upon the ability and generosity displayed in it. Other foreign *diplomats* were present.

Dr. Cheever delivered a grand lecture upon War-Emancipation at the Smithsonian on Friday night. To think of Dr. Cheever's delivering "an abolition lecture" at the Institute of which Chief Justice Taney is a Regent! It will seem hard to go back to the old Union, if the slavemasters and their manners are to come back with it! "We have things our own way now!" exclaimed a Republican Senator a day or two since, and the freedom to say what one pleases on the subject of slavery here almost startles one from his propriety. There were many things in Dr. Cheever's lecture which the audience did not approve, but they looked upon him as the representative of free speech and of anti-slavery principles, and gave him a cordial reception in consequence.

On Sunday afternoon he preached to a crowded audience in the Representatives Hall. The sermon was upon the subject of Emancipation, and it was received with the most attentive respect.

Is there to be a speedy advance of our troops upon the enemy? Almost everyone here says, Aye. Gen. McClellan keeps silence. So does Mr. Seward. President Lincoln admits that he does not fully comprehend his General. Mr. Cameron told a Senator, a few days since, that he could not *promise* any immediate fighting. Still it is the opinion of all the prophets in Washington that we shall in a few days, or at the outside weeks, have some very hard and decisive fighting. Gen. McClellan said long ago to a friend, that he should not be crowded into a premature advance. It is understood here that there is a perfect understanding between him and Mr. Seward. It is even rumored that certain things are discussed between them which not even the President is permitted to understand. Perhaps this is not so, but it is the rumor here. One thing is certain—if McClellan does not move on soon, he will lose his place. If he waits till April, he will end his own military career.

AVON.

Our Boston Correspondence.

FROM AN OCCASIONAL CORRESPONDENT.

THE SUMMARY.—The trials of the Church at Corinth compared to those of the faithful in Boston—"*Concerning* BULL"—Shylock on Secession—Springfield and Enfield rifles—The character of the two armies—Mr. Thompson's great magnanimity—Theodore Parker, his biographer and publishers—The Tragedy of Errors, a poem to be highly commended, etc., etc.

BOSTON, Jan. 13, 1862.

AMONG the causes declared by Saint Paul for his hope in his Corinthian converts was this, that they had learned "to suffer fools gladly." Yet, however promising such sufferance may be, as showing a tendency and direction towards the Christian character, it can never be held to imply any very distinguished attainment therein. It is not extremely difficult to recognize the importance of dullness in the economy of things, and to feel gratitude that the world is never deprived of it. But if the Church in Corinth ever learned *to suffer clever men gladly*, the Apostle had indeed cause to rejoice in the success of his ministry. Now, since the conductors of the English press, and the leaders of English opinion, are notoriously not fools, you cannot be suprised that we Boston people have not attained those serene heights of wisdom where they may be joyfully endured. And let it be observed that just here in Boston, we have, at times, been even ridiculous in our exalted estimate of Englishmen, and English institutions. Not only have we humbled ourselves and truly confessed that we have no such living men as Stuart Mill and Buckle, Carlyle, Ruskin and Tennyson; but we have been obliging enough to import and admire English manufactures infinitely inferior to our own production. I remember when people who considered themselves representatives of American cultivation, used to talk more of the stories of Kingsley and Reade than of the magnificent romances of Hawthorne; and a few months ago we were ready to exchange *The Atlantic salt* of Holmes for a second-hand chance at the prolix parson of English Fraser. We have hitherto ignored the British character, save in those household and private relations where it appears in a kind and amiable light. The conduct of England towards the world at large, which is, indeed, the test of national as of individual disposition, has been covered with the broadest mantle of charity. Transferring to her the immensely greater difficulties of our own position, we have allowed that one righteous act of Emancipation in a distant colony to screen her bloody progress in India and her contempt for the republican principle everywhere but at home. Well! it has been rather trying, to face for the last four weeks this blustering ally of what was basest in our State. There is, I believe, no American city where the hostile spirit shown by England in this Trent affair has been more deeply and painfully felt. We cannot forget how wrong and evil has seemed her disposition in being pettily and technically right. If ever the maxim, *Summum jus, summa injuria*, carried with it a truth to be recognized of all men, it appears to us to have been in this case. If there is one great principle taught by English history, is it not this, that Law must have a Conscience? Shylock bullying for his pound of flesh, in the day of the Merchant's disaster and bankruptcy, seems to us no less morally savage because it was not exceptionable to exact legalities.

Although what is called irritating language may be properly avoided, it is well for sensible men in both countries to be aware of the facts of the existing offence. The pretence that we have wished to get up a quarrel with England seems to us almost too shallow for any sane mind. The repeated evidences of friendship we have shown England in the day of our wealth and power, the man-of-war loaded with provisions for the relief of British subjects, the search after Franklin, the return of the abandoned exploring vessel, the costly and delicate entertainment of the prince—let these go for what they may be worth. But as outvaluing them all, I instance the extraordinary facilities we accorded to the English for improving their manufacture of arms as giving evidence of a most confiding and unsuspicious friendliness. It is well known that the exquisite machinery, by which the irregular parts of the rifle are now made in England, was derived from the government works at Springfield, in this State. I am informed by the highest authority that these very skilful inventions were of a character so intricate and complicated, that they never could have been stolen by drawings or otherwise. Indeed, it required the most thorough explanation, the most ample opportunities for inspection and test, to induce the commissioners sent in behalf of England to accept the Yankee improvements by which they are now able to turn out rifles by the hundred thousand. As a suitable return for this very friendly act, which made possible the present rifle organizations of England, an embargo is put upon arms that have been already purchased by Americans, and they are compelled to sell them again at whatever loss may be necessary. We cannot forget the frivolous pretext upon which England has hastened to send —— troops to this country, whose presence seems designed to threaten or embarrass peaceful citizens who have taken up arms to hold slavery at bay, even if not pledged to destroy it altogether. You see I have substituted a dash for the adjective first applied to English soldiers. It is no time for hard words when hard facts will do better. Those who have seen, as I have, average specimens of the eight or nine hundred letters that are received weekly from the privates in our regiments—letters of manliness, modesty, love of freedom for white and black—such persons may read this extract from the evidence given by the Duke of Wellington before the Royal Commission on Military Punishments, and then supply my omission as they think fit.

"*The man who enlists into the English army is generally the greatest drunkard, probably the worst man in the trade or profession which he follows, or in the town or village where he lives. There is not one in a hundred who, at the time of his enlistment, does not belong to the latter class, or to the very outcasts of society.*"

I write these things merely to put upon record the feeling of the best people I meet concerning the moral responsibility of England in pursuing the course into which she seems to have fallen. The men of property and standing in this city are painfully sensitive to the paralysis with which the "misguided-brethren" theory has affected our arms at the South—though I cannot assert their readiness to support a change of policy. But if, through dire necessity, we are forced into foreign war, the whole wealth, strength and energy of our people will be thrown against any *outside* patron of slavery with a vigor that will be terribly felt. As I believe your journal reaches a limited English public, let me say that we are honestly trying to exercise that forbearance and charity which we hope all the liberal-minded abroad will endeavor to exercise towards us. As every phase and impulse of opinion is committed to the press, it is well for both parties to regard all single expressions of the newspapers as hardly worthy even of ephemeral and transient notice. There are many here who will endeavor to deserve the noble magnanimity shown to this country by Mr. George Thompson, whose address you printed last week. I trust there are few Boston men who can read unmoved that generous allusion to "Faneuil Hall, the ancient cradle of liberty in New England," whence Mr. Thompson was brutally driven by a mob. Through all temporary jealousies and prejudices, a few such men could lead the public mind in both countries to a mature and rectified position.

The publishers give us occasional impulses to what is noble and honorable, hardly consistent with the utterly disorganized society prophesied about these days by Dr. Russell. They seem to fancy that there is yet some good and heroic feeling in this many-headed *demos*, which it is not impossible to reach. Walker and Wise have recently published a volume of Mr. Parker's prayers, as a prelude to the inevitable "Life and Letters," due in the spring. The biographer, as I hear, does not stand in any of the prohibited degrees of relationship to his subject, and something of a high order of merit is confidently predicted. Concerning the value of the present publication, no one mind can pretend to speak for another. The bridges over which men pass from necessity to aspiration, from phenomena to reality, are so various that degrees of comparison cannot be established among them. None can say how many individual hearts these prayers may purify and expand. There is, of course, no allusion to doctrine or scheme among them, neither (a very common defect in congregational prayers) is feeling sacrificed to thought. Mr. Parker seems to stand with almost stubborn firmness upon his own ground of trust, and certainly shows that the available value of religion need not always be missed in attempting intellectual mastery over it. Of course, those who retain more or less of the Puritan faith of New England can be attracted to them only as to memorabilia of a faithful and earnest man.

Some of your readers will have seen ere this the first part of an admirable American poem, The Tragedy of Errors. In modesty, beauty, and strength, it forms a delightful contrast to the clinical lectures people have lately put forth as life-drama poetry. Indeed it is so characterized by quiet elegance of diction, and sensibleness and simplicity of treatment, that one half doubts its success amid the highly spiced literature to which we are accustomed. "No real object is unpoetical," said Goethe, "if the poet knows how to use it properly." Leaving the well-gleaned fields of legendary reminiscence generally thought appropriate for dramatic poetry, the writer has boldly concerned herself with the most intricate problem, as well as the most practical duty, presented to this country. American Slavery is treated in a wholly original, and very striking manner. A far deeper perception of the character of our national sin than one which dwells upon incidents and facts is everywhere apparent—it is the heart and substance of the thing which is laid bare. Instead of fixing the reader's attention upon the so-called evils of Slavery, a high moral atmosphere is shown above it, into which neither master or slave can enter while the mutual curse is upon them. Not the expediency of anti-slavery truth is here presented, but its intrinsic loveliness and necessity. It is by sympathy, so deep as almost to deserve the name of affection, that the writer comprehends the doubts, joys and trials of the outcast race—she passes into their experience, and in higher language than they can command renders their feeling and hope. In delicate contrast to its general subject, the poem contains a beautiful expression of the truth that it is, after all, restraint and not liberty that is for our profit and honor—only the restraint must be imposed from within, not from without. I allude to the admirable picture of a New England household, contained in the portion called Noon. This seems to me as accurately drawn and true to nature as anything in Aurora Leigh; while it is given without the high-pressure adjectives which are crammed into that famous production. The dramatic power shown in the concluding portion of the poem, and the great capabilities of the situation in which the characters are left, command the interest of the reader for the Second Part, which is now in press. In justice to the Tragedy of Errors, and to what has been said of it, I mention that it is not a thing to read *hastily* or *once*. The blank-verse conversation of the field-hands, and their unfeigned respect for the King's English (I dare not say the *President's* English) strikes one a little queerly at first. But there are Virgil's agricultural clowns, who have been talking hexameters at each other for eighteen hundred years, and really there is no good reason why a man should be denied poetical, any more than political, privileges on account of his complexion. Those for whom this poem is written—be they many or few—will find in it abundance of wise and sober thought, of true poetic sensibility, added to a comprehensiveness of treatment which recognizes principles before incidents, and instructs by enlarging instead of concentrating the mental vision.

* * X.

FORM OF PETITION TO CONGRESS.

CIRCULAR.

THE undersigned having prepared with care and after mature deliberation, the accompanying petition on the subject of "EMANCIPATION," recommend it to the public for general adoption and circulation. Copies may be obtained from either of the subscribers.

New York, December, 1862.

W. C. Bryant,	Andrew W. Morgan,
Wm. Curtis Noyes,	Andrew Bowdoin,
H. A. Hartt, M.D.,	James Higgins,
J. W. Edmonds,	Geo. B. Cheever, D.D.,
James McKaye,	John T. Wilson,
Oliver Johnson,	S. S. Jocelyn,
Wm. Goodell,	J. R. W. Sloane,
J. E. Ambrose,	Theodore Tilton,
Samuel R. Davis,	Dexter Fairbank,
Edward Gilbert,	Jas. Freeland,
Nathan Brown,	Samuel Wilde,
Mansfield French,	Charles Gould,
Edgar Ketchum,	Alexander Wilder,

Wm. C. Russell.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND TO CONGRESS

The People of the United States represent:

That they recognize as lying at the very foundation of our government, on which has been erected the fabric of our free institutions, the solemn and undying truth, that by nature all men are endowed with an inalienable right to liberty.

That, so far as this great truth has been in any respect departed from, by any of our people, or by any course of events, the toleration of such departure has been caused by an overshadowing attachment to the Union, and by conscientious fidelity to those with whom we had voluntarily united in forming a great example of free government.

That such departure—whether willing or unwilling, whether excusable or censurable—has nevertheless given birth to a mighty power in our midst—a power which has consigned 4,000,000 of our people to slavery and arrayed 6,000,000 in rebellion against the very existence of our government: which, for three quarters of a century has disturbed the peace and harmony of the nation, and which has now armed nearly half a million of people against that Union which has been hitherto so dear to the lovers of Freedom throughout the world.

That by the very act of the Slave Power itself, we have, all of us, been released from every obligation to tolerate any longer its existence among us.

That we are admonished—and day by day, the conviction is gathering strength among us—that no harmony can be restored to the nation, no peace brought back to the people, no perpetuity secured to our Union, no permanency established for our government, no hope elicited for the continuance of our freedom, until slavery shall be wiped out of the land utterly and forever.

Therefore, we who now address you, as co-heirs with you in the inheritance of freedom, and as free men of America, most earnestly urge, upon the President, and upon Congress—

That, amid the varied events which are constantly occurring, and which will more and more occur, during the momentous struggle in which we are engaged, such measures may be adopted as will ensure emancipation to all the people throughout the whole land, and thus complete the work which the Revolution began.

COL. T. B. THORPE, well known in literary circles, and for nearly twenty years a resident of the South, will speak at Hope Chapel on Monday evening next, giving what he calls an "Inside View of the Great Rebellion." We have reason to believe that his lecture will be very interesting, and we hope our friends will give him a hearing. Abolitionists should be prompt to recognize and encourage every new advocate of the cause.

CHANGE IN THE CABINET.—Simon Cameron, Secretary of War, has been removed, and Edwin M. Stanton, formerly of Pittsburg, Pa., nominated by the President to fill his place. Mr. Cameron has been nominated for Minister to Russia, to succeed Cassius M. Clay, recalled by his own request. The Senate had not, as late as Tuesday, confirmed either of these nominations, though there is no doubt it will soon do so.

There is a wide difference of opinion among the newspapers as to the cause of Mr. Cameron's removal—some of them attributing it to his anti-slavery policy in the conduct of the war, and others intimating that his relations with army contractors had something to do with it. Our own belief is that he has been thrown overboard to appease the pro-slavery Border State men who have thus far controlled the policy of the President. Mr. Stanton, however, is said to be in favor of an energetic prosecution of the war, and we perceive that *The Tribune* regards his appointment with favor.

Proceedings of Congress.

WE are obliged to condense our record of Congressional proceedings this week into a very narrow space.

In the Senate, a considerable number of anti-slavery petitions have been presented, among them one by Mr. Sumner, from citizens of New York and Brooklyn, protesting against sending the slaves out of the country, but proposing instead to colonize the slaveholders! On the 9th, Mr. Sumner spoke on the Trent case. [See fourth page.] The rebel senators (Johnson and Polk) of Missouri were unanimously expelled; and the case of Mr. Stark, appointed to Col. Baker's place, was referred to the Judiciary Committee. On Tuesday, Marshal Lamon sent in a communication in answer to the inquiry addressed to him by the Senate, in regard to the exclusion of members of Congress from the precincts of the Washington jail. His answer was considered a highly insulting one, and during the excitement occasioned by it, the bill providing for a jail delivery, introduced several days ago, was taken up and passed. An effort was made to exclude fugitive slaves from its provisions, but it failed; but an amendment was made, that hereafter no person shall be confined in the jail without a warrant from a magistrate or court, or an order from one House of Congress. Only four members voted against its passage—Messrs. Carlile of Virginia, Kennedy of Maryland, Powell of Kentucky, and Saulsbury of Delaware. [We may publish extracts from the debate hereafter.]

In the House, on the 9th, a letter was received from the Secretary of War, in which he states that measures had been taken to ascertain who is responsible for the disaster at Ball's Bluff, but that it would be incompatible with the public interest to disclose the nature of those measures at present. On Monday, Mr. Dawes (Rep., Mass.) made a scathing speech exposing frauds upon the treasury. On Tuesday, the bill to abolish the franking privilege from and after the first of July next, was passed, 107 to 43. The bill making an appropriation for sending American products for exhibition to the World's Fair was then t

Miscellaneous Department.

'TIS COME AT LAST.

'Tis come at last!—the conflict dread
'Twixt Freedom's hosts and Slavery's herds;
Cannon resound in rhetoric's stead,
And sabr s clash in place of words;
The politician's craft is o'er—
'Twere well dispensed with long before!

Poor drivelling carles, and brainless fools,
And moral nondescripts, to deem
Union can live while slavery rules!
A vile conceit, a guilty dream!
No league hath long cemented stood
In groans, and shrieks, and tears, and blood.

And groans and shrieks enough have risen
To rend the earth from strand to strand;
And tears and blood enough have flowed
To thrice o'erwhelm our hapless land;
A faithful record God hath kept,
Though men have thought His justice slept.

'Tis come at last! I see it now,
In myriads mustering for the fight;
Men of the firm, unblenching brow,
Strong in the consciousness of right,
Behold stern Retribution's rod,
The vengeance of an outraged God!

So stalks His justice ever forth,
When Pride and Cruelty, grown strong,
Have made a prison-house of earth,
And marred its lovely scenes with wrong;
Much more when Crime, so deeply dyed,
Beneath His holy word would hide.

Ah, tyrants! did ye think to hold
Bible and lash in either hand?
At once, be *sheep* in Jesus' fold,
And bear the *wolf's* ignoble brand?
Your slave-pens by God's temple rear,
And wed your boudmen's groans with prayer?

Well, haste! before *your* altars bow;
Seek *Southron* priests' and prophets' aid;
For Freedom's hosts are gathering now,
And on they march with thundering tread.
The time has come the test to try—
Your idol now shall live or die!

Press on, ye patriot host, press on!
God fights not on the oppressor's side;
Your country's flag aloft be thrown,
'Tis Freedom's emblem, Freedom's pride!
Guilty Concession's day is past,
The reckoning-day has come at last!

Concession! Scheme conceived in hell!
Moloch to set on high with God,
Put Lust with Chastity to dwell,
Give Crime and Virtue one abode!
'Tis well, the shameful compact ends,
God's covenant bow now o'er us bends.

'Tis come at last! The recking field,
The booming gun, the leaping flame,
Foretell that Fraud and Wrong must yield;
That God will vindicate His name.
Shout, patriots, with each clarion's blast,
"'Tis come at last!—'tis come at last!'"

—*N. Y. Sunday Mercury.*

THE SURRENDER OF MASON AND SLIDELL.

SPEECH OF CHARLES SUMNER.

From The Herald.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 9, 1862.

THE speech of Mr. Sumner in the Senate to-day, on the Trent affair, was a masterly and exhaustive exposition of the triumph of American principles as applied to international law. In all his arguments and illustrations he left our respected mother England "out in the cold." He demonstrated that by all other leading European Powers the American doctrine had been recognized and admitted for many years, and that England alone had opposed it. The inconsistency of the present position of England, with her policy in all the past, was admirably illustrated, and the conclusion, that Great Britain is now stopped from any future assertion of her doctrine in reference to the right of visitation and search, was brilliant and effective. The speech was impressively delivered. The galleries of the Senate were densely crowded. Notwithstanding the inclemency of the weather, the ladies' gallery was filled to overflowing. Mrs. Vice-President Hamlin and a party of her friends occupied seats in the diplomatic gallery, which was also filled. Secretaries Chase and Cameron occupied seats on the floor of the chamber, where were also the French, Russian, Austrian, Prussian, Danish and Swedish Ministers. Lord Lyons was not present, as etiquette required that he should not be there on such an occasion. M. Mercier, the French Minister, occupied a seat next to Mr. Bright, and exchanged salutations with Mr. Sumner at the conclusion of the speech, as did also most of the other foreign dignitaries.

Mr. Sumner's speech has created a marked impression on the public in regard to himself. It has removed much prejudice that existed against him, and added greatly to his reputation as a profound statesman. The impression prevailed that, with all his learning, his extraordinary acquirements, and splendid talents, he could not avoid the introduction of his peculiar views in reference to slavery; and on account of the strong anti-slavery proclivities of England hitherto, and the sympathy heretofore from this cause existing between leading English politicians and our own anti-slavery men of Mr. Sumner's class, it was apprehended by many that he would be inclined to lean towards Great Britain in this controversy. His course to-day was, therefore, an agreeable surprise. The absence of any allusion in his speech to the negro question demonstrated his ability and willingness to rise superior to the one idea attributed to him, and the scathing exposition of British inconsistency in regard to the right of search, and the dignified rebuke he administered to England, exhibited his capacity to regard public affairs with the eye of a genuine statesman.

The applause accorded to this really great production is universal and unqualified.

From The World.

The carefully-prepared speech which Mr. Sumner delivered in the Senate yesterday (Jan. 9th) is an important contribution to the stock of current information on an important question of public law. The arrest of Mason and Slidell has not before been discussed with so much breadth of research. Mr. Sumner's luminous speech is a remarkable example of the advantage of historical knowledge in the discussion of public questions. The chief value of the speech consists in its copious array of citations from a long line of American statesmen, the combined force of which is irresistible in establishing these points: (1.) That, by the settled American doctrine, Capt. Wilkes could not be allowed to be the final judge as to whether the rebel envoys were contraband, and (2), that in accordance with the settled American doctrine an admiralty court would have been compelled to decide against the legality of the arrest if the Trent had been brought in for adjudication. These positions are supported by the cumulative authority of a long line of American statesmen, extending from Thomas Jefferson, the first Secretary of State under our government, down to Gen. Cass, the last Secretary of State previous to the outbreak of the rebellion. Our statesmen have strenuously maintained that only military persons in actual service of the enemy are liable to seizure on a neutral ship. A long list of treatises is also cited by Mr Sumner, both in proof of this point and to show that our government has held that dispatches are not contraband of war. It is true that the British government has held a contrary doctrine; but Mr. Sumner shows that our government has always protested against it, and denied that it was international law. He also shows that the American view is that held by the maritime nations of continental Europe.

It is creditable to Mr. Sumner that he has been able to present so conclusive an historical argument in opposition to the view of this subject taken by legists and publicists so able and erudite as Mr. Everett, Mr. Cushing, Professor Parsons, and Chief Justice Bigelow, of his own State, and most of the public journals in all parts of the country. The error of these writers has consisted in an undue deference to the British admiralty decisions—decisions against whose validity on the points involved in this controversy our government has always protested.

CONCLUSION OF MR. SUMNER'S SPEECH.

If I am correct in this review, then the conclusion is inevitable. The seizure of the rebel emissaries on board a neutral ship cannot be justified according to our best American precedents and practice. There seems to be no single point where the seizure is not questionable, unless we choose to invoke British precedents and practice, which beyond doubt led Capt. Wilkes into the mistake which he committed. In the solitude of his ship he consulted familiar authorities at hand, and felt that in following Vattel and Sir William Scott, as quoted and affirmed by eminent writers, and reenforced by the inveterate practice of the British Navy, he could not err. He was mistaken. There was a better example; it was the constant, uniform, unhesitating practice of his own country on the ocean, refusing to consider dispatches as contraband of war—refusing to consider persons, other than soldiers or officers, as contraband of war; and protesting always against an adjudication of personal rights by the summary judgment of a quarter-deck. Had these well attested precedents been in his mind, the gallant Captain would not, even for a moment, have been seduced from his allegiance to those principles which constitute a part of our country's glory. Mr. President, let the rebels go. Two wicked men, ungrateful to their country, are let loose with the brand of Cain upon their foreheads. Prison doors are opened, but principles are established which will help to free other men, and to open the gates of the sea. Never before in her active history has Great Britain ranged her- [illegible] event is an epoch. *Novus sæclorum nascitur ordo.* [A new course of the ages begins.] To the liberties of the sea this Power is now committed. To a certain extent, this cause is now under her tutelary care. If the immunities of passengers, not in the military or naval service, as well as of sailors, are not directly recognized, they are at least implied; while the whole pretension of impressment, so long the pest of neutral commerce, and operating only through the lawless adjudication of a quarter-deck, is made absolutely impossible. Thus is the freedom of the seas enlarged, not only by limiting the number of persons who are exposed to the penalties of war, but by driving from it the most offensive pretension that ever stalked upon its waves. To such conclusion Great Britain is irrevocably pledged. Nor treaty nor bond was needed. It is sufficient that her late appeal can be vindicated only by a renunciation of early, long-continued tyranny. Let her bear the rebels back. The consideration is ample; for the sea became free as this penitent Power crossed it, steering Westward with the sun, on an errand of liberation. In this surrender, if such it may be called, our government does not even "stoop to conquer." It simply lifts itself to the height of its own original principles. The early efforts of its best negotiators—the patriot trials of its soldiers in an unequal war—have at length prevailed, and Great Britain, usually so haughty, invites us to practice upon those principles which she has so strenuously opposed. There are victories of force. Here is a victory of truth. If Great Britain has gained the custody of two rebels, the United States have secured the triumph of their principles. If this result be in conformity with our cherished principles, it will be superfluous to add other considerations of policy; and yet I venture to suggest that estranged sympathies abroad may be secured again by an open adhesion to these principles, which already have the support of the Continental governments of Europe, smarting for years under British pretensions on the sea. The powerful organs of public opinion on the Continent are also with us. M. Hautefeuille, whose work on the Law of Nations is the arsenal of arguments for neutrals, has entered into this debate with a direct proposition for the release of these emissaries as a testimony to the true interpretation of international law. And a journal, which of itself is an authority, *The Revue des Deux Mondes*, hopes that the United States will let the rebels go, simply because "it would be a triumph of the rights of neutrals to apply them for the advantage of a nation which has ever opposed and violated them." But this triumph is not enough. The sea-god will in future use his trident less; but the same principles which led to the present renunciation of early pretensions, naturally conduct to yet further emancipation of the sea. The work of maritime civilization is not finished. And here the two nations, equally endowed by commerce, and matching each other, while they surpass all other nations, in peaceful ships, may gloriously unite in setting up new pillars, which shall mark new triumphs, rendering the ocean a highway of peace, instead of a field of blood. The Congress of Paris, in 1856, where were assembled the plenipotentiaries of Great Britain, France, Austria, Prussia, Russia, Sardinia, and Turkey, has already led the way. Adopting the early policy of the United States, often proposed to foreign nations, this Congress has authenticated two important changes in restraint of belligerent rights; first, that the neutral flag shall protect enemy's goods except contraband of war, and secondly, neutral goods, except contraband of war, are not liable to capture under an enemy's flag. This is much. Another proposition, that privateering should be abolished, was defective in two respects; first, because it left nations free to employ private ships under a public commission as ships of the navy, and, therefore, was nugatory; and, secondly, because if not nugatory, it was too obviously in the special interest of Great Britain, which, through her commanding navy, would be thus left at will to rule the sea. No change can be practicable which is not equal in its advantages to all nations; for the Equality of Nations is not merely a dry dogma of international law, but a vital national sentiment common to all nations. This cannot be forgotten; and every proposition must be brought sincerely to this equitable test. But there is a way in which privateering can be effectively abolished without any shock to the Equality of Nations. A simple proposition, that private property shall enjoy the same immunity on the ocean which it now enjoys on land, will at once abolish privateering, and relieve the commerce of the ocean from its greatest perils, so that, like commerce on land, it shall be undisturbed except by illegal robbery and theft. Such a proposition will operate equally for the advantage of all nations. On this account, and in the policy of peace, which our government has always cultivated, it has been already presented to foreign governments by the United States. You have not forgotten the important paper in which Mr. Marcy did this service, or the recent efforts of Mr. Seward in the same direction. In order to complete the efficacy of this proposition, and still further to banish belligerent pretensions, contraband of war should be abolished, so that all ships may freely navigate the ocean without being exposed to any questions as to the character of persons or things on board. The Right of Search, which, on the occurrence of war becomes an omnipresent tyranny, subjecting every neutral ship to the arbitrary invasion of every belligerent cruiser, would then disappear. It would drop, as the chains drop from an emancipated slave; or rather it would only exist as an occasional agent, under solemn treaties, in the war waged by civilization against the slave trade; and then it would be proudly recognized as an honorable surrender to the best interests of humanity, glorifying the flag which made it. With the consummation of these reforms in maritime law, not forgetting blockades under international law, war would be despoiled of its most vexatious prerogatives, while innocent neutrals would be exempt from its torments. The statutes of the sea, thus refined and elevated, will be the agents of peace instead of the agents of war. Ships and cargoes will pass unchallenged from shore to shore, and those terrible belligerent rights, under which the commerce of the world has so long suffered, will cease from troubling. In this work our country began early. It had hardly proclaimed its own independence before it sought to secure a similar independence for the sea. It had hardly made a Constitution for its own government before it sought to establish a constitution similar in spirit for the government of the sea. If it did not prevail at once, it was because it could not overcome the unyielding opposition of Great Britain. And now the time is come when this champion of belligerent rights "has checked his hand and changed his pride." Welcome to this new alliance. Meanwhile, amid all present excitements, amid all present trials, it only remains for us to uphold the constant policy of the republic, and to stand fast on the ancient ways.

DEATH OF A CONTEMPORARY OF THE POET BURNS.

WALTER GLOVER, known as the carrier between Dumfries and Edinburg, in the time of Burns, died on Sunday last, at Ferneyside, in his native parish of Liberton—an extraordinary example of longevity, being in his 104th year, having been born on the 18th July, 1758. Of late there have been recorded the deaths of persons of from 70 to fourscore years who were able to say that when children they had seen our great national bard; but here was a man who was born before the poet himself, and had frequent occasion to meet and converse with him—a recollection the old man warmly treasured. When Burns was exciseman at Dumfries, rum was extensively imported there, and Glover was frequently employed to convey it to Edinburg. The permits on these occasions required to be signed by the poet, and, contingent on the arrival of the vessels, these documents were often required either at a very late or a very early hour. Glover was wont to state, as a proof of Burns' regularity and business habits, that sometimes when he used to apologise for disturbing him at these untimely hours, the poet said: "Walter, it is but my duty, and never hesitate at any hour to call on me to do it." Glover and his connection with Burns were thus alluded to at the Great Centenary Meeting at Edinburg, 25th January, 1859: The chairman (Lord Ardmillan) said, "I understand that we have now present among us in this great assemblage the only man who saw the day which this day celebrates—one man alone, when generations have been swept to their graves, lives to be present now, who lived when Burns was born. There is a man in this room who is now more than a hundred years of age (loud cheers)—who was alive when the poet Burns was born, and who personally knew that immortal man. He is here in this room—Mr. Walter Glover, who was the carrier between Dumfries and Edinburg in the days of Burns, who has seen Burns, whose eye has met the eye of Burns, whose voice has met the voice of Burns, whose ear has heard the words of Burns" (loud cheers). Mr. Walter Glover then ascended the platform amidst loud cheers, and to the amazement of the audience recited "Tam o'Shanter," from beginning to end, with a strong voice, and with "due emphasis and discretion." Till within the last twelvemonth, this memorable old man was in the habit of walking frequently to Edinburg—a distance of between three and four miles; and his chief enjoyment was sitting by the fireside playing the fiddle, which he did with considerable skill. Within the last two years he wrote out the poem of "Tam o'Shanter" in a bold, steady, legible hand, amazingly like the poet's handwriting, and this was done without the aid of spectacles. For the last few months Time has been laying his inexorable hand upon him, but very gently, and he retained possession of his faculties, his memory especially, to the very last. It is only a month ago that he was heard to relate, with great unction, some of his humorous stories, and to make some shrewd observations on recent and passing events. He was a great reader—an enjoyment of which his failing sight nearly deprived him during the last year; and he had a rare gift of remembering every remarkable event he had seen, heard, or read of since he was three years old. He was kindly nursed and attended by his daughter—a very worthy person, who has hitherto maintained herself, and supplemented the parochial allowance to her father by what she earned at out-door labor; and this really excellent woman is well stricken in years.—*Scotsman.*

FOR THE ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

MR. EDITOR: The following lines were suggested to the writer on reading "A Song of the Contrabands, O LET MY PEOPLE GO," as somewhat appropriate to the present crisis.

LET THE BONDMEN GO!

WHEN Afric was in Dixie's land,
They plead for mercy so;
Oppressed so hard on every hand,
They cried, "O let us go!"
With brawny arms uplifted high,
For mercy hear them pray,
With burning tears and bitter sigh,
"*O let our people go!*"

Chorus—Go down Freedom, 'way down in Dixie's land,
And bid the haughty tyrant foe
To let the bondman go.

The Lord on high has heard their prayer,
O let his people go!
As God is Israel's God, forbear,
And let his people go!
He's heard their cry, and thus decreed:
"It shall not long be so!
I'll break the power, annul the deed,
That binds my people so!

"Though sable hands you bind in chains,
Nor aught in fear forbear,
Yet latent in the soul remains
A power that yet shall dare
To strike the blow, in deadly fray,
And bring the oppressor low;
To light the torch—to lead the way—
And bid my people go.

"No more let men in bondage toil,
Nor scourge my people so;
The blast of war the oppressor 'll spoil,
If you let my people go.
Go down with Freedom, hand in hand,
Proclaim it as you go;
'Tis Freedom's cause—'tis Freedom's land—
This only dare to know.

"Then I will nerve each freeman's hand
To strike the final blow;
And thus will save your stricken land,
From every vengeful foe.
Go down with clanking chains, to urge
The freedman to his task again,
And war shall prove a bitter scourge—
Defeat the end you'd gain.

"'Tis Freedom now must lead the way,
O let the bondmen go!
A fire by night—a cloud by day—
Shall lead them safely through;
They'll not get lost, nor wander far,
The freedmen as they go;
They see the star—their guiding star—
'Twill lead them safely through.

"The foe shall not before you stand—
The oppressor's yoke shall bend;
But make the land all Freedom's land,
And keep it to the end;
Then I will lend a listening ear,
My people all are free;
The song of songs all men shall hear—
The song of jubilee."

Chorus—Then go down Freedom, away to Dixie's land,
And bid the haughty tyrant foe
Let every bondman go!

Norwich, Ct., Dec., 1861. N. S. W.

MIND OR MUSCLE?—PEACE OR WAR?

[HENRY WARD BEECHER—in a lecture delivered in many places, and to be delivered, perhaps, in many more—maintains the rightfulness of war and exhausts his powers of ridicule upon peace men. We find in *The Liberator* an abstract of a lecture delivered before the Fraternity in Boston, by E. H. HEYWOOD, in which the argument on the other side is thus forcibly presented.]

SOCIETY is a materialist—believes in the coat, not the man. Whoso looks into a popular sin, gets the door slammed in his face. Government is founded on force. The Church cowers under the mailed arm of the State. The ultimate appeal is muscle, not mind. There is sad truth in the joke of the English wit, who went to the Sayers and Heenan fight to see the ruling class of the race. This faith in the fist, this gospel according to bullies, is a seed of barbarism, whose bloody efflorescence in the war system is now the nosegay of nations. Yet war is the despair of ideas and the soul; repeals God, and "makes the universe a mob of worlds careering round the sky."

I know the arrows of wit and sarcasm recently showered upon the advocates of peace by the most eloquent man in the American pulpit, still hurtle in this air. Nevertheless, I am inclined to believe the peace principle, moral force agitation as opposed to the sword, a doctrine of common sense as well as of Christianity, and some day it will be respectable as well as true. Not to play hide-and-seek with you among texts, though the argument is impregnable there, the character of Christ is decisive on this point. His mission being to regenerate society, and his doctrines in bold antagonism with all its organized forces, was he right in going to Calvary, or should he have marched at the head of an army as Major-General Jesus? (Applause.) No one denies that the ideas of Jesus, *culminating in the cross*, have given him the dominion of all other religions, and affixed his name to the highest civilization of history.

Lying is one of the "fine arts" of war. They call it strategy! Yorktown was won by a lie, and Washington told it. John Brown went to Harper's Ferry under a false name; but as he was an abolition saint, we did not say much about it. All agree that murder is the gravest crime man commits; but war is only murder multiplied by the majority. By what ethics, then, is the man a criminal and the mass heroes? Can we "serve God individually, and the devil collectively"? War is the tap-root of slavery. Abolitionism is not the whole of truth. I would not have you men of "one idea." If the whole is greater than a part, to kill a man is a graver sin than to enslave him; for life bases and includes all other human rights. The logic of the fathers is inevitable. To men born free and equal, *life*, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are inalienable rights. Then war violates love, the divinest law of nature, "the bright consummate flower" of religion. English Bishops pray to be endowed with the spirit of Christ while slaying their enemies; and the New Zealander shows his love of a man by roasting him for his dinner; but the affection you bear your brother in slaughtering him is not apparent.

But it is objected that the instinct of various lower animals is belligerent and carnivorous; that when the lion and the lamb lie down together, "the lamb must be inside the lion"; and hence, man being the king of killers, war is natural, foreordained by an imagined God of battles. It was gravely argued from this platform, that because a bird pecks bugs, man *must* slay man. But if this analogy holds, you must not only kill, but *eat* your brother; hence, cannibalism also is a divine institution; likewise irresponsible murder. Still worse—this argument ultimates in practical atheism; for if man is under the domination of brutish instincts, and cannot resist them, there is no power of choice, and free agency is a fiction. War is not health, but disease, the *delirium tremens* of the debauched body politic. But self-defence, is it right? Certainly, by all right means. "Self-preservation is the first law of nature." But how much of yourself will you save? Self is composed of soul and body; to save your life by sin, you lose your soul; to lose your life for truth, you save your soul. I go for the soul (applause). You would not do wrong, would not lie, steal, betray, to save your life; will you commit the greatest crime to live? I grant there is something better than life; it is honor, it is purity, truth, character. Take a case: Col. Corcoran languishes in a felon's dungeon of slavedom. When the President of the rebellion, cracking his slave whip over Mr. Lincoln, said, "Hang my privateersmen as pirates, and I will hang your officers"; when the honor of the government was at stake, the question being whether it executes its laws because they are laws, or only at the beck of the insolence that breaks them—from that lone dungeon whose only light looks on the gallows, I seemed to hear the brave leader of the 69th speak—"I freely devoted myself upon the altar of my country, and am concerned for her life, not my own. Honor to me is more than life; how much greater the honor of my country! Then, whether I live or die, execute your laws!" (Loud applause.) You applaud that, because you would have him sacrifice everything before his allegiance to free institutions. There walked this earth one who lived his allegiance to that higher and perfect realm, where reason is religion, "love is liberty, and nature law." His faith in man's integrity infinite, his love embracing every nation and all ages, he went to the cross, rather than harm a hair of his murderous enemies; and, lo! history writes, "The most inspired of idealists, the divinest martyr to the human soul, the moral law-giver of his race!" (Applause.) But I merely wished to bear my testimony against the prevailing disposition, to treat with levity the gravest moral issue that has engaged the attention of men since Calvary.

This ideal force, so long banished from American politics, now returns to the control of the republic. The hour is at hand—its dawn whitens the dome of the Capitol—when even the President must see, that common sense as well as Cameron is an emancipationist. The South is dying of the naval blockade, but much faster of the moral blockade of the world.

Voltaire said, the adjective is the greatest enemy of the noun, though it agrees with it in gender, number and person. The anti-slavery enterprise is only an insurrection of adjectives against slavery. As in Webster's phrase, the Revolution was fought on a preamble; so slavery was broken on a sentiment. The South did not fear Lincoln, but the Niagara of *The Liberator*—Cheever—and the white plume of Sumner behind him. This is not merely a question of politics. Politics never originates—is the tail, not the head of society. The Abolitionists were responsible for this rupture only as geologists are responsible for earthquakes. They were merely the heralds of this Olympic game, the executors of God's providence. The conflict is in the nature of things. The fathers mixed slavery with freedom in the Federal caldron: behold now the hell-broth of civil war! The "irrepressible conflict" is older than Mr. Seward, older than Mr. Garrison. Before this government crested forth on the refluent wave of the Revolution—before this continent, from the ocean, rose beautiful as Venus from the Grecian sea—far away in the counsels of eternity, God foreordained liberty, and slavery to perish.

From a "thirty years' war" of words, these two ideas have passed to blows. Children of the Declaration of Independence, the programme of the Milennium, we ought to have repudiated slavery on moral grounds. The Abolitionists prescribed the only means of avoiding the war. Immense as is the darkening, threatening cloud, all its bolts would have dropped harmless into the earth by the "heaven tipped virtue" of emancipation. By the application of the peace principle, which never compromises, the whole cause of the war would have been quietly removed. On the contrary let us have no hypocrites; those who believe religiously in a government of force are bound now to consecrate *their* method to the highest moral purpose of which it is capable—the death of slavery.

DR. BROWNSON ON THE WAR.

[ORESTES A. BROWNSON, LL.D., in the January number of his *Quarterly Review*, has an article entitled "The Struggle of the Nation for Life," from which we give extracts.]

MANY worthy people regard war, especially a civil war like that which is now raging in the American Union, as the greatest calamity that can befall a nation, and so great is their horror of war that they seem willing to purchase peace at any price, even by national dishonor and national degradation. Yet war is rather the effect of evil than the evil itself. The real evil is in the causes that precede and lead to it. In our case it is the effort of the sound part of the nation to expel a disease long since contracted, and which was gradually but steadily approaching the seat of life, and threatening us with complete dissolution. To the eye of enlightened patriotism our condition as a people is less deplorable to-day than it was four years ago, before the war broke out. . . . Without war we had no chance of prolonging our national life. With the slave interest in full power in nearly one half of the Union, and by its combinations ruling the councils of the nation; with Young America reckless and destitute of principle, managing our politics at the North under the lead of Fernando Woods and New York *Heralds*; with the laxity of morals becoming almost universal in politics and business, in public life and private; with the growing tastes and habits of luxury and extravagance prevalent throughout the land, we were well nigh a lost people; our destruction as a nation was, if no change came, only a question of time, and thoughtful and far-seeing men were beginning to despair of the republic. The impending ruin, in the ordinary providence of God, could be averted only by the war which has broken out and is now raging. We deplore with our whole heart the causes which made the war necessary and inevitable, but we do not and cannot grieve that it has come, or lament the sacrifices it compels us to make.

We need not fear that, if we bring home to the revolted States all the horrors of war, we shall make them one whit more hostile to us than they now are, or more difficult to be reconciled to the Union after the war is over.

We wish the people of the loyal States to understand well that the people of the disloyal States will regard any show of forbearance, tenderness, or magnanimity on our part only as weakness, tameness, or fear of losing them as our customers. These things are thrown away upon them, and injure instead of serving the cause of the Union and reconciliation. The South will never believe in our sincerity and magnanimity till we have given them a sound drubbing, and proved ourselves the better men. Then they will respect us, and consent to live in peace and brotherhood with us. They take every advantage of us, and we must take every advantage of them, and force them by the damage we do them into submission. Nothing else remains for us. They will not submit unless forced to submit; but when forced into submission and fully convinced that further resistance is vain, they will, we doubt not, with far less difficulty than many imagine, become reconciled to national union with us. They have great respect for power, and worship force as a god. With them, as with all men in their stage of civilization, perhaps even in ours, the stronger is the better man, and to real superiority they will deem it no dishonor to yield.

If the contest end favorably to us, as it certainly will, unless we throw away our advantages, we shall lag behind no one in our efforts to make the terms of reconciliation easy; but we urge now the prosecution of the war with all of war's severity, and with all the energy of a free government and a brave and heroic people. Especially do we protest against any compromise. If we are beaten, as we may be—for the race is not always to the swift, nor the battle to the strong—we will submit to the victor and take what comes. But we insist on preserving our dignity as men, our honor as States, and fall, if fall we must, with our principles. Let no man dare breathe the word "compromise." The day for compromise has gone by. The man, be he President, or Secretary, or Senator, or General, who shall propose and effect a compromise, will stand branded in history as an infamous traitor to his country and to humanity.

We tell the President, and we desire to do so with all possible respect, that even the restoration of the Union on a policy shaped expressly to conciliate "Ole Kentuck," or the slaveholding interest of any of the border States, would now, if possible, not be worth effecting. Why was he elected to the Presidency? Why have we of the loyal States placed him in his present elevated position? No man better than himself knows that we voted for him at the risk of civil war and the dissolution of the Union, because we were determined that the slave interest should no longer shape the policy and govern the councils of the nation. It was this determination on the part of the freemen of the East, the North and the West that took Mr. Lincoln from his law-office and made him President. He was not elected to preserve slavery, nor to abolish slavery; but he was elected to emancipate the Administration and the republic itself from the domination of the slave interest; and we protest, therefore, in the name of those who elected him, against the perpetuation of that domination, even though confined to the slave interest of Maryland, Kentucky and Missouri. Slavery may or may not continue to exist, but we insist that the government shall cease to be administered in its interest or under its dictation. The government must be administered in the interest of freedom and loyalty. If not, better yield to the secessionists at once, and take Jefferson Davis for our President. We will not pour out our blood and our treasure, we will not send the flower of our youth and the glory of our manhood to rot in camp, die on the battle-field, or languish in Southern dungeons, for the sake of bringing the Union again under the domination of Southern slaveholders, and of exposing ourselves to be again insulted and bullied, or cheated out of our rights and our manhood by the Davises, the Toombses, the Hammonds, the Masons and the Slidells. We have resolved that our government shall be emancipated, whatever becomes of slavery and its worshippers. This is what we beg the Administration to bear in mind. We should be glad to believe that the President has not forgotten it, and that he is prepared to assert his own independence of the Slave Power, and that of the government, for we tell him never will there and never can there be a reunion of the separated States under the domination of the slave interest.

We have no concessions to make to Kentucky or to any other border slave State. The slaveholders have rebelled against the Union, and by so doing have absolved the Union from all obligations to protect slavery in either loyal or disloyal States. If Kentucky, the native State of the President, will not remain in the Union, unless permitted to dictate its policy and make her slave interest its law, then let her be treated as a rebel State, and coerced as we are coercing the other rebel States into loyalty. We will no more consent to allow Kentucky than South Carolina or Georgia to impose her slave policy upon the government. We of the free States intend to assert and maintain our own freedom, our own rights and dignity, and to be something else hereafter in the government of the country than the mere lackeys of Southern slaveholders. We are fighting to vindicate our own rights, and our government must recollect that in this contest it is bound to take our rights, the rights of freemen, into the account. We wish the Administration to consider that we of the free States have accepted the issue tendered us, and that we will spend our last dollar and our last life before we will suffer this Union to be sacrificed in the vain endeavor to preserve the infamous institution of negro slavery, and before the slave interest shall ever again shape the policy of the government or dominate in its councils. If Mr. Lincoln has not learned this yet, he will, perhaps, learn it before the close of the present session of Congress. We have been in bondage to the capital invested in slavery long enough; we have long enough cowered and crouched under the lash of slaveholding dictators, afraid even to say our souls are our own, lest we should endanger the peace and safety of the Union. We will do it no longer.

Events march, as we said three months ago, and they are marching with fearful rapidity. We are carried along with them. To many of us what six months ago seemed the extreme of rashness now appears timid, tame and cowardly. The government, if it would guide events, must march with them. The President, we perceive, marches—slowly, indeed, but, nevertheless, he marches—and his message proves that he is at least some steps in advance of where he was at the close of the extra session of Congress. He will, probably, march at a more rapid pace by and by, and, perhaps, catch up with public opinion.

We do not want the war waged or prosecuted for the abolition of slavery; but we do insist that it shall not be waged or prosecuted for the protection of slavery and its reinstatement in power. Slavery has rebelled, and let it pay the forfeit. We have no confidence in the wisdom, we had almost said in the loyalty, of the statesman who insists that the government has any further obligation toward it now than to brush it aside if found in its way.

ABOUT THE FIRE.

WHEN Summer's roseate couch is stript,
And Autumn's frost our garner fills,
And Winter lifts his hoary head
Above the bare-browed northern hills:

When gables quaint and sloping eaves
Are hung with ornaments of ice,
And window panes traced o'er and o'er
With tree, and flower, and strange device;

When lane and paddock for awhile
Are carpeted with virgin snow,
And truant feet betray themselves
When from the beaten path they go;

How pleasant 'tis to draw one's chair
About the fire as night descends;
And cosy con some favorite page,
Or join in chat with genial friends.

To quaff the social cup of tea,
And talk about the olden time,
Ere we had known the cares of men,
Or joy of putting thoughts in rhyme.

Ere we had joined the field of fight,
To battle for our daily bread,
Or learned how oft fair truth is crushed
Beneath the money-seeker's tread.

The table cleared, the candles trimmed,
And wife's accustomed corner ta'en,
From joke to anecdote we slip—
From gay to grave, from land to main.

We wander 'neath a burning sun
With Bruce, or Park, or Livingstone;
With Ross or hapless Franklin track
The ice wastes of the frigid zone.

A pause; Song now becomes the theme,
We dwell on Milton's sacred lay,
Seek Shelly in his mystic flight,
Or Keats, who died while yet the bay

His brow had won was being wove;
Then list while Tennyson doth fling
Rare notes upon the wind, and then
Take freshening drafts from Browning's spring.

Thus lured by pleasantries, Old Time
Glides swiftly on; at length we start
To find how late it is—shake hands,
And grieve that we're compelled to part.

Then, while ye sing to verdant Spring,
Of Summer with her birds and flowers—
And Autumn's fruitage—add a strain
To Winter, for his social hours.

MR. HALLIWELL AND THE SHAKSPEARE PROPERTY.

OWING mainly to the strenuous exertions of Mr. J. O. Halliwell, the whole of the £1,500 required for the purchase of Shakspeare's garden at New-place, Stratford-on-Avon, has now been subscribed. We append herewith a complete list of the donors: Henry Huth, Esq.; G. L. Prendergast, Esq.; H. B. Sheridan, Esq., M.P.; William Tite, Esq., M.P.; James Parker, Esq.; Benjamin Webster, Esq.; F. W. Cosens, Esq.; a Lady, anonymously; Miss Burdett Coutts, James Dugdale, Esq.; Henry Johnson, Esq.; Lord Overstone, the Misses Moore, C. H. Bracebridge, Esq.; and Charles Rawlings, Esq. Each of the above gave the sum of £100 in furtherance of the project. Encouraged by this success, Mr. Halliwell has determined to make still greater efforts in the cause he has so much at heart. He has bought the larger garden at New-place for £2,000, rendering himself liable for more than £1,000 of the purchase-money; and proposes to buy, in addition, the following property directly associated with the poet's memory, viz., the remainder of the birthplace estate; Anne Hathaway's Cottage, with an endowment for a custodian; Getley's copyhold, which formerly belonged to Shakspeare; and any other property at or near Stratford-on-Avon which the bard may have owned, or which may be connected with the events of his life. But Mr. Halliwell does not stop here. He wishes to calendar and to preserve such records at Stratford-on-Avon as may illustrate the events of the poet's life, or the contemporary history of his native town, and also to erect and endow a public library and museum there. In order to carry out these various objects, he considers that from £50,000 to £60,000 will be required, and this he proposes to raise by subscriptions of not less than £5 each, the amount so collected to be called the "National Shakspearian Fund." A prospectus, issued by Mr. Halliwell, gives the fullest details respecting the manner in which this fund is to be distributed and its management controlled. We need only remark of those details that they show, in the most conclusive manner, the willingness of the enthusiastic originator to undertake a very large amount of labor and responsibility in order to carry out an important proposal, which invites the coöperation of all who reverence our great poet's memory.

GEN. THOMPSON ON SLAVERY.

To the Editor of The London Morning Advertiser:

SIR: The notice of my letter to my old constituents, in your paper of the 26th, gives me an opportunity of renewing a correspondence with yourself which in times past has made a subject of pleasant memory.

The fallacy I charge on some of the professing enemies of slavery is, that they deal with countries as if they were single individuals, and not compound bodies, in which all imaginable parties struggle, and each gets uppermost when it can.

Comparison will be the briefest illustration. Suppose that in the struggle in England to put down the slave trade (at the moment, say, when Wilberforce had concluded his four hours' speech, and been put down by a majority) foreign friends had gone about saying, "It is sheer hypocrisy for England to talk of wanting to put down the slave trade. It is clear it wants no such thing. There are hostile majorities in the Commons, and in the Lords the Royal Princes and the Bishops are against it."

Would it not be plain that foreign friends had made a great mistake, and we might justly say to them, "Call ye this backing up your fellows?"

Or, suppose again, that in the contest upon the Corn Laws—a year, we will say, before the final decision—our friends abroad had said, "It is nonsense to talk of England being in favor of free trade. If England were polled at this moment, two-thirds would be against it. A few fanatics make a great noise, but they are not England. And three-fourths of those who join, have no pure moral motive. They have all some reason of their own, political or commercial. It is an attempt to play with a great moral principle, and degrade the vaunted immutability of justice. Therefore, let the hungry masses starve, till the barrier can be broken through by a rush of men with pure moral motive." Could there be a better way to prop the Corn Laws?

Hoping that this may lead to further opportunities, I have great satisfaction in thinking on the classes before whom the question will be laid by its appearance in your pages, and remain,

Yours, very sincerely,

T. PERRONET THOMPSON.

Eliot-vale, Blackheath, Dec. 27, 1861.

RIGHT OF PRIVATE JUDGMENT.—How many illuminations of celestial origin come to all in sincere hours! Are these inspirations to be subjected to the authority of any tribunal? All expression of *will* by bodies and individuals that others should think as they do is tyranny. Numbers have no more right than a single person to enforce doctrine. They are each and all fallible, and are bound to special caution lest they should exert an influence over each other unfriendly to impartiality. A community so bound to an opinion as to abandon a man, and to be unjust to his character, who questions it, is a persecutor as much as if it used legal penalties.—*Channing.*

NEW SERIES OF TRACTS

PUBLISHED BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY

AND TO BE OBTAINED AT THE

Anti-Slavery Offices, 5 Beekman street, New York; 106 North-Tenth street, Phila.; and 221 Washington street, Boston.

No. 1. Correspondence between Lydia Maria Child and Governor Wise and Mrs. Mason, of Virginia. 3 cents.

No. 2 Victor Hugo on American Slavery, with letters of other distinguished individuals, viz., De Tocqueville, Mazzini, Humboldt, Lafayette, &c. 5 cents.

No. 3. An Account of some of the Principal Slave Insurrections during the last two Centuries. By JOSHUA COFFIN. 5 cents.

No. 4. The New Reign of Terror in the Slaveholding States, for 1859–'60. 10 cents.

No. 5. Daniel O'Connell on American Slavery; with other Irish Testimonies. 5 cents.

No. 6. The Right Way the Safe Way, proved by Emancipation in the West Indies and elsewhere. By L. MARIA CHIL